

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/13/2022 02:08 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Center for Civic Education (S423A220078)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	35	33
Significance		
1. Significance	25	25
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	20
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
Sub Total	100	98
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. Educator Diversity	5	3
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
1. Promoting Equity	3	3
Competitive Preference Priority 3		
1. Meeting Student Needs	2	2
Sub Total	10	8
Total	110	106

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - FY22 SEED Panel - 1: 84.423A

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Center for Civic Education (S423A220078)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. A. Quality of Project Design (35 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 training or professional development services to be provided by the proposed project are of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration to lead to improvements in practice among the recipients of those services.
(7 points)

(ii) 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.(7 points)

(iii) The extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework.
(7 points)

(iv) 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.
(7 points)

(v) The extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs.
(7 points)

Please provide Overview Statement on top of first Strength comment.

Strengths:

The applicant thoroughly describes the training and professional development services that will be provided by the proposed project. The quality, intensity and duration of the training/professional to lead to improvements in practice among the recipients of those services is appropriate for the proposed plan. The proposed project is appropriately designed to build capacity. Limited evidence of how the applicant will yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance is noted in the narrative. The applicant provides a solid conceptual framework underlying the proposed research activities. Comprehensive evidence that the planned project involves the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project services is described in the narrative. Further, the applicant appropriately discusses the needs of the targeted area, and describes a proposed project that is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population.

i. We the People: Civics that Empowers All Students (CEAS) will increase the number of diverse and highly effective educators through an evidence-based project that provides teachers with preparation, PD, and ongoing support as they engage with students throughout their careers. This project innovates and improves the Center's acclaimed WTP civic education PD and curricular program in the upper elementary and middle grades (4–8) to meet the needs of today's diverse educators and learners with numerous identities, abilities, and challenges (e18). The Center is the undisputed leader in the professional development of civics teachers in the United States across various variables, with over 60 empirical research studies that have consistently demonstrated the effectiveness of the Center's programs for teachers and students (e22). In the three-year program, 1,350 teachers will be recruited to participate. This recruitment effort will

include 300 classroom teachers in Year 1, 450 classroom teachers and 50 pre-service teachers in Year 2, and 450 classroom teachers and 100 pre-service teachers in Year 3. Consistent with the Learning Policy Institute's research on duration, CEAS will provide these teachers fifty-two hours of PD workshop sessions in the summer and the academic year (e23).

ii. The Center will host online and in-person state coordinator meetings throughout the program to increase state-level capacity in program administration, professional training, outreach to local and state education leaders and stakeholders, and sustainability (e31). From the time they join the project, state coordinators will develop sustainability plans in concert with the Center and local- and state-level educational leaders to ensure that state capacity to implement the enhanced PD and WTP curricular program continues beyond the end of the grant (e31). Plans for building capacity in school and building lasting training capacities are also appropriately outlined (e31-e32).

iii. A detailed logic model guides the conceptual framework which includes the existing conditions, project plan (inputs and actions) and the outcomes (short and long-term).

iv. A comprehensive list of LEA partners and content experts (e175-e180) the applicant will collaborate with is listed and described. The Center's collaboration with expert consultants and scholars in political science, civics, SEL, trauma-informed education, and UDL will bring multiple perspectives and research-informed expertise to developing new WTP PD tools and strategies (e34).

v. The design of the CEAS PD matches the blended-learning JMLP PD model that met WWC evidence standards and increased high-need students' attainment of state civics standards (e35). Additionally, the applicant notes, the integration of new evidence-based PD content and expertise in SEL, UDL, trauma-informed practices, and inclusive instruction will enhance the attainment of civics, literacy, SEL, and equity goals and transform students' classroom experiences (e36). The applicant also notes the proposed project will improve teachers' pedagogical content knowledge, meet the need for qualified teachers for underserved students, and meet the need for a diverse teacher workforce (e36-e37).

Weaknesses:

- i. No weaknesses noted
- ii. The sustainability plan is limited in that they do not currently have a system in place for attaining funding beyond the funding period (e31) (2 points not awarded).
- iii. No weaknesses noted
- iv. No weaknesses noted
- v. No weaknesses noted

Reader's Score: 33

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. B. Significance (25 points)

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

(i) The importance or magnitude of the results or outcomes likely to be attained by the proposed project, especially improvements in teaching and student achievement. (7 points)

(ii) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the number of persons to be served and to the anticipated results and benefits. (6 points)

(iii) 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.
(6 points)**

**(iv) 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.
(6 points)**

Please provide Overview Statement on top of first Strength comment.

Strengths:

The applicant clearly describes a significant impact that are likely to be attained by the proposed project, especially improvements in teaching and student achievement. The budgeted items provided in the application are appropriate and reasonable in relation to the number of persons to be served and to the anticipated results and benefits. Additionally, the applicant provided comprehensive evidence of a plan for incorporating the project activities into the current program after Federal funding has ended. Further, thorough evidence of how the applicant plans to disseminate in ways that will enable others to use the information or strategies is provided in the narrative.

i. The applicant specifies a significant need for civic engagement and the proposed problem addresses these problems by fostering significant gains in teachers' and their students' civic knowledge, skills, and dispositions, which will enhance their capacity to participate competently and responsibly in their political system (e39). The Center's programs foster attitudes of political empowerment that lead to increased student participation in the political life of their communities (e40). The program is particularly critical to developing literate, aware, and empowered learners of diverse backgrounds to combat issues such as polarization, gerrymandering, and false claims in the media that hinder democratic progress (e40).

ii. The budget reflects reasonable and appropriate funding to meet the objectives and outcomes specified in the narrative. CEAS will provide 1,350 participating teachers with fifty-two hours of PD and ongoing support. They will, in turn, provide 65,700 students with a deeply engaging and empowering learning experience and reach many more students beyond the grant. Costs for the program include personnel, contracts to state partner organizations, training for more than 150 mentor teachers, online resource development and hosting, and CERL's independent evaluation (e44).

iii. Appropriately, the applicant notes the Center and its partner organizations in each state will sustain the project elements beyond the grant period as part of their established missions (e44). They specify that through its staff, online presence, and the assistance of partner organizations, programmatic resources and support are continually provided to teachers throughout the country regardless of external funding (e45). Further, the applicant notes, beyond the grant, the Center will maintain regular communication with its state partners and provide support in seeking additional state and local sources of funding for WTP PD for teachers at all levels. It will also provide funding support through revenue-sharing agreements with the states from sales of its curricular materials (e46).

iv. The applicant clearly indicates that they CEAS study results will provide civic education leaders and practitioners with more information on effective pedagogy and add to the research literature on elementary teacher preparation in civics, trauma-informed practices, recruitment and support of diverse teachers, and literacy and SEL across the curriculum (e47). Additionally, the findings of formative and summative evaluation of all major aspects of the project will be available to other organizations through the Center's and the CERL's websites (e47). They will also maintain a webpage that will describe the program, highlight key impacts, report research results, identify related organizations, and link to the online PD and instructional resources (e47).

Weaknesses:

- i. No weaknesses noted
- ii. No weaknesses noted
- iii. No weaknesses noted
- iv. No weaknesses noted

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. 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 extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable. (10 points)

(ii) 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. (10 points)

Please provide Overview Statement on top of first Strength comment.

Strengths:

The management plan provided included four clearly articulated goals, objectives and outcomes that are clearly measurable. In addition, the management plan is thoroughly developed and can be achieved on time and within budget. The responsibilities for the key personnel are clearly listed in the narrative. In addition, the applicant provides a detailed management chart including objectives, activities, timelines, personnel and milestones that are outlined for clearly accomplishing project tasks.

i. One clearly articulated goal with corresponding objectives and measurable outcomes are articulated in the narrative. The goals and objectives are clearly mapped to the activities, outcomes and measures to be used to evaluate effectiveness (e50-e51).

ii. The applicant clearly specifies that the Center will implement CEAS working with state partner organization sub-recipients grouped into twenty-five single- and multi-state PD sites (e52). Specific steps the Center will take to facilitate the efficient functioning of the project include (1) annual site directors' planning conferences of state coordinators who work for state partner organizations, mentor teachers, and members of the evaluation team; (2) mentor workshops to expand their knowledge and capacity to train and support other teachers; (3) site visits to participating states and schools; (4) distribution of quarterly progress reports to state coordinators and monthly newsletters to all participants; and (5) regular communication with sub-recipients and CERL by email, phone, and videoconferencing (e52). Key personnel include: a project director with support staff at the Center, a project team composed of Center staff who will monitor programmatic and fiscal compliance in fifty states and the District of Columbia and provide ongoing technical assistance, fifty-one state coordinators affiliated with organizations in the Center's national network (District of Columbia included), 100 or more school-district coordinators appointed by their administrations, 1,350 teachers, and 65,700 students over the project period (e51; e53). Further a detailed timeline including objectives, milestones, time to complete the tasks and the lead responsible party for ensuring the tasks are completed (e53-e54).

Weaknesses:

- i. No weaknesses noted.
- ii. No weaknesses noted

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (20 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, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the WWC standards with or without reservations as described in the WWC Handbook.

(4 points)

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

(4 points)

(iii) 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.

(4 points)

(iv) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on Relevant Outcomes.

(4 points)

(v) 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.

(4 points)

Please provide Overview Statement on top of first Strength comment.

Strengths:

Comprehensive evidence of an evaluation plan that is grounded in research that, if well implemented, will produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the WWC standards with or without reservations as described in the WWC Handbook is noted in the narrative. The evaluation plan contains detailed information on the extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes. Formative and summative data will be collected. The performance measures described are clearly aligned to the project goals, and the research questions described should produce both quantitative and qualitative data. Detailed data is provided to determine that the results will be valid or reliable. Further, the applicant provided a plethora of strategies for dissemination of data and results for replication of the study.

i. The applicant clearly outlines six research questions that will be appropriately assessed. The research team will assess the impact of the CEAS PD on in-service teacher and student outcomes associated with the project goals using a multi-site, school-level RCT designed to meet WWC standards without reservations (e56). The RCT design provides for randomized assignment of schools to intervention and control groups. The RCTs will have sufficiently large sample sizes to ensure high-quality analyses. Fifty schools will be randomly assigned to each intervention and control group (100 schools per year) for the three study cohorts. In total, 150 schools will be assigned to the intervention group and 150 schools to the control group (300 schools total over three years). Schools will be assigned entirely by chance; any differences in assignment probabilities will be adjusted according to the methods specified by the WWC (e57).

ii. The applicant clearly specifies that CERL will provide frequent updates to the Center, state coordinators, and other key personnel about the performance-tracking data and the results of the evaluation research, including short executive summaries to be readily distributed. CERL will time interim and full-cohort reports to coincide with completing the quantitative impact evaluation phases. The Center will host a yearly conference for coordinators, mentor teachers, and expert consultants to share information and focus on best practices (e59).

iii. A variety of appropriate measures that will yield quantitative and qualitative data will be administered. Teacher

measures including content knowledge and self-efficacy will be gathered. The measures are derived from established, reliable, and previously validated outcome measures from research studies (e60). Student outcomes will be measured using established, reliable, and previously validated measures that meet WWC standards derived from state civics rubrics, grade-appropriate civics tests, and standardized tests, including NAEP (e61).

iv. The validity and reliability of the performance data will be established through methods as defined by the WWC standards for outcome measures. We will assess the face validity of the measures by providing a clear definition of each concept and establishing that the description of the outcome measure aligns with the content. A team of expert educators and academics convened by CERL will assess validity. They will rate how well the measures achieve what they purport to assess. The reliability of the measures for this study must meet WWC requirements for maximum allowable random measurement error. The internal consistency of outcome measures will be determined by a Cronbach's alpha of .50 or higher, and the test/retest reliability must be .50 or higher (e61). The applicant will also triangulate the data collected.

v. CERL researchers will recommend strategies and best practices for instituting the testing in particular settings. They will describe the steps in the research process, sampling procedures, testing instruments and rubrics, and analyses sufficiently to enable others to replicate the study. Materials related to the evaluation, including survey instruments, will be accessible for researchers, educators, administrators, policymakers, and other stakeholders without restriction on the CERL website. Data will be made available to researchers through Georgetown University's secure institutional repository (DigitalGeorgetown, Georgetown University Library) and DataONE (e64).

Weaknesses:

- i. No weaknesses noted
- ii. No weaknesses noted
- iii. No weaknesses noted
- iv. No weaknesses noted
- v. No weaknesses noted

Reader's Score: 20

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1

1. Competitive Preference Priority 1: Increasing Educator Diversity (Up to 5 points)

Under this priority, applicants must develop projects that are designed to improve the recruitment, outreach, preparation, support, development, and retention of a diverse educator workforce through adopting, implementing, or expanding high-quality, comprehensive teacher preparation programs that have a track record of attracting, supporting, graduating, and placing underrepresented teacher candidates, and that include one year of high-quality clinical experiences (prior to becoming the teacher of record) in high-need schools.

Strengths:

The applicant provides adequate information on how they will improve the recruitment, outreach, preparation, support, development, and retention of a diverse educator workforce through adopting, implementing, or expanding high-quality, comprehensive teacher preparation programs that have a track record of attracting, supporting, graduating, and placing underrepresented teacher candidates, and that include one year of high-quality clinical experiences. The applicant will use existing networks to carry out professional learning, and facilitate ongoing participant engagement. Their state coordinators will work in 25 single- and multi-state sites reaching educators and learners in 50 states and the District of

Columbia. Over three years, the project intends to (1) increase the number of highly effective and diverse teachers in grades 4–8 by providing professional preparation and support to 1,350 teachers, including at least 50% teachers of color and provide professional preparation and support to teachers working in at least 400 schools with significant populations of underserved students (e21).

Weaknesses:

Limited data on how they will recruit these teachers is provided in the narrative. There is also no evidence on how the targeted schools, with underserved populations, will be selected (2 points not awarded).

Reader's Score: 3

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 2

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 2: Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities
(up to 3 points)**

Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate that the applicant proposes a project designed to promote educational equity and adequacy in resources and opportunity for Underserved Students—

(1) In one or more of the following educational settings:

- (i) Early learning programs.**
- (ii) Elementary school.**
- (iii) Middle school.**
- (iv) High school.**
- (v) Career and technical education programs.**
- (vi) Out-of-school-time settings.**
- (vii) Alternative schools and programs.**
- (viii) Juvenile justice system or correctional facilities;**

(2) That examines the sources of inequity and inadequacy and implements responses that include pedagogical practices in Educator preparation programs and professional development programs that are inclusive with regard to race, ethnicity, culture, language, and disability status so that educators are better prepared to create inclusive, supportive, equitable, unbiased, and identity-safe learning environments for their students.

Strengths:

The applicant clearly specifies that, CEAS will increase the number of diverse and highly effective teachers in high-need upper elementary and middle schools, thereby increasing equitable access to quality instruction for underserved students. It will provide teachers with professional learning and support to implement WTP effectively and in an inclusive manner in their classrooms. (e24; e27)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted

Reader's Score: 3

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 3

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 3: Meeting Student Social, Emotional, and Academic Needs
(up to 2 points)**

Projects that are designed to improve students' social, emotional, academic, and career development, with a focus on Underserved Students, through developing and supporting Educator and school capacity to support social and emotional learning and development that—

- (1) Fosters skills and behaviors that enable academic progress;**
- (2) Identifies and addresses conditions in the learning environment, that may negatively impact social and emotional well-being for Underserved Students, including conditions that affect physical safety; and**
- (3) Is trauma-informed, such as addressing exposure to community-based violence and trauma specific to Military- or Veteran-Connected Students.**

Strengths:

The applicant indicates that WTP fosters competencies across the SEL framework: (1) self-awareness, (2) social awareness, (3) responsible decision-making, (4) self-management, and (5) relationship management (e24). They also note that the proposed program will include strategies such as creating inclusive, supportive, equitable, unbiased, and identity-safe learning environments for students (e25). The PD program will include explicit content on SEL, trauma-informed practices, culturally relevant teaching, and alignment with ELA and other academic content standards (e25).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/13/2022 02:08 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/14/2022 02:36 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Center for Civic Education (S423A220078)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	35	32
Significance		
1. Significance	25	25
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	20
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
Sub Total	100	97
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. Educator Diversity	5	4
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
1. Promoting Equity	3	3
Competitive Preference Priority 3		
1. Meeting Student Needs	2	2
Sub Total	10	9
Total	110	106

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - FY22 SEED Panel - 1: 84.423A

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Center for Civic Education (S423A220078)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. A. Quality of Project Design (35 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 training or professional development services to be provided by the proposed project are of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration to lead to improvements in practice among the recipients of those services.
(7 points)

(ii) 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.(7 points)

(iii) The extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework.
(7 points)

(iv) 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.
(7 points)

(v) The extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs.
(7 points)

Please provide Overview Statement on top of first Strength comment.

Strengths:

The applicant clearly identifies a strategy for professional development that is of quality, intensity, and duration. As proposed, the project only demonstrates sound strategies to build capacity that it should yield results beyond the period of the federal grant. The conceptual framework is adequate, and as such, it shapes the quality of the proposed activities. The proposed project partners in this collaboration maximize the effectiveness of the proposed program services. As a result, the design of the project is appropriate to, and successfully address the identified needs.

Supporting Statements:

Strengths:

A1- In the three-year program, 1,350 teachers will be recruited to participate. This recruitment effort will include 300 classroom teachers in Year 1, 450 classroom teachers and 50 pre-service teachers in Year 2, and 450 classroom teachers and 100 pre-service teachers in Year 3. Consistent with the Learning Policy Institute's research on duration, CEAS will provide these teachers fifty-two hours of PD workshop sessions in the summer and the academic year (Darling-Hammond, Hyler, and Gardner 2017). (p. 6).

A1 - Over three years, the project intends to (1) increase the number of highly effective and diverse teachers in grades 4–8 by providing professional preparation and support to 1,350 teachers, including at least

50% teachers of color; (2) increase the achievement of at least 65,7003 students in attaining state standards in civics, relevant ELA standards, and SEL competencies; (3) provide professional preparation and support to teachers working in at least 400 schools with significant populations of underserved students; and (4) evaluate the effectiveness of the WTP PD and curricular programs, utilizing the blended-learning PD model demonstrated to be effective in JMLP and strengthened with new, targeted resources and methods for grades 4–8. Once completed, new CEAS PD videos and materials will be available to all educators and the general public at Learn.civiced.org. The PD model is adaptable to a fully virtual program that can be implemented when in-person meetings are not practical or affordable, such as during the COVID-19 pandemic. This approach reinforces the equity of access to high-quality professional opportunities across the country.

A1- The WTP curricular program is evidence-based and demonstrably improves ELA and SEL competencies of underserved populations (Owen, Hartzell, and Sanchez, 2020; Hartzell 2020; Rosen 2000). CEAS will increase the number of diverse and highly effective teachers in high-need upper elementary and middle schools, thereby increasing equitable access to quality instruction for underserved students. (p. 6).

A1 – Effective instruction in WTP increases students’ problem-solving, critical-thinking, decision-making, and communication skills, which are essential to academic success across disciplines and 21st century work and civic life (Owen and Riddle 2017; Owen and Hartzell 2019). WTP fosters competencies across the SEL framework: (1) self-awareness, (2) social awareness, (3) responsible decision-making, (4) self-management, and (5) relationship management (Balfanz and Byrnes 2020; Zins et al. 2007). (p. 7)

A1 - Teachers will participate in 52 hours of workshops. Following the JMLP PD model, teachers will participate in a 36-hour summer institute followed by 16 hours of workshops during the academic year coinciding with student civics instruction. Importantly, the Center’s network of state coordinators and mentors will provide ongoing follow-up. (p. 9)

A1 - Researchers will also collect qualitative data on the program’s impact on the teachers and their mentors, including the nature, effectiveness, and outcomes of their collaborative efforts and their integration of civics, ELA, SEL, and equity goals in their classrooms. Data also will be collected on teachers’ professional satisfaction, support, and retention. (p. 12)

7 points

A2 - From the time they join the project, state coordinators will develop sustainability plans in concert with the Center and local- and state-level educational leaders to ensure that state capacity to implement the enhanced PD and WTP curricular program continues beyond the end of the grant. (p. 14).

5 points

A3 – The applicant identifies strategies that build capacity in its proposed application. (e31).

6 points

A4 - The design of the CEAS PD matches the blended-learning JMLP PD model that met WWC evidence standards and increased high-need students’ attainment of state civics standards. Therefore, it is reasonable to claim that the proposed project will have the same positive outcomes. The integration of new evidence-based PD content and expertise in SEL, UDL, trauma-informed practices, and inclusive instruction will enhance the attainment of civics, literacy, SEL, and equity goals and transform students’ classroom experiences.

7 points

A5 - The CEAS PD program addresses the need to improve the content knowledge and instructional strategies of teachers working with underserved students to help bridge civic achievement, empowerment, and opportunity gaps between high-need and more advantaged students (Herczog 2012; Levinson 2010, 2012). In addition, it is compelling that the project responds to the needs of teachers of underserved students (p. 19), a diverse teacher workforce (p. 20), the need for civic education (p. 20), and the need to improve literacy, SEL, and other cross-disciplinary outcomes (p. 20).

7 points

Weaknesses:

A1 – No weaknesses noted.

A2 – The proposal narrative indicates that district leaders how the PD fits with state and local district standards and goals for civics, ELA, and SEL and will improve engagement and learning outcomes among underserved students. (p. 14). It would appear that alignment would be a consideration of program design, not after potentially being funded.

2 points

A3 – The application would benefit would benefit from some initial strategies on sustainability that would extend the efforts of this project beyond the grant. (p. 14).

1 point

A4 – No weaknesses noted.

A5 – No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 32

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. B. Significance (25 points)

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

**(i) The importance or magnitude of the results or outcomes likely to be attained by the proposed project, especially improvements in teaching and student achievement.
(7 points)**

**(ii) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the number of persons to be served and to the anticipated results and benefits.
(6 points)**

**(iii) 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.
(6 points)**

**(iv) 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.
(6 points)**

Please provide Overview Statement on top of first Strength comment.

Strengths:

The proposed project demonstrates improvements in teaching and student achievement. The proposed relationship to numbers served and anticipated results and benefits demonstrate that project cost are reasonable. As proposed, moreover, there is strong potential for the applicant to incorporate the project activities into the ongoing program of the organization at the end of federal funding. The application documents how the proposed project will be disseminated to enable others to use the strategies generated in this project.

Supporting Statements:

Strengths:

B1 - The national need to further the civic mission of public education in the United States is especially significant now that public trust in government remains near historic lows (Pew Research Center 2021; Edelman 2022; Gallup 2021), election turnouts are low (United States Election Project 2020), political polarization is high (DeSilver 2022), and political information-sorting is common (Mason 2015). The civic empowerment gap exacerbates these problems because political power is concentrated among more privileged populations (Levinson 2010). In addition, there has been a decades-long decline in involvement in other aspects of civic life and community involvement, national service, and volunteering (Jeffrey and Sargrad 2019). This project addresses these problems by fostering significant gains in teachers' and their students' civic knowledge, skills, and dispositions, which will enhance their capacity to participate competently and responsibly in their political system. (p. 22).

B1 - Systematic reviews of research demonstrate that civic education results in cognitive learning, increases in intellectual and participatory skills, improved academic achievement, positive attitudes towards school, and improved attendance (Deakin Crick et al. 2005; Campbell 2019; Loesch-Griffin et al. 1995; Weiler et al. 1998; Darling-Hammond et al. 2020; Driscoll and McCusker 2022). Civics instruction during the school years can impart lasting democratic proclivities and prime citizenship orientations that develop over a lifetime (Pasek et al. 2008; Kahne and Sporte 2008). Disadvantaged and minority students who have few resources for civic learning outside of school experience pronounced knowledge gains from civics classes (Voight and Torney-Purta 2013; Gainous and Martens 2011; van Deth et al. 2010; Owen 2020). Clearly, there is a link between civic education and student achievement, and marginalized students would not typically have access to this type of intervention outside of school or this project. This is compelling.
7 points awarded.

B2 – The applicant proposes to serve 1,350 CEAS teachers will directly work with more than 65,700 students in at least 400 schools in 50 states and the District of Columbia during this grant. Once tested, the entire program will be put online free for use as self-directed tutorials, online courses, blended-learning, or other forms of PD programs. The research base and availability of the program will be made widely known by CERL, the Center, members of its national and international networks, and cooperating national organizations. Therefore, it has the potential to reach every grade 4–8 teacher in the country and public- and private-sector organizations in the eighty-four other nations that have participated in the Center's Civitas International Programs. The proposed budget provides both experience in managing federal projects of this size and provides a rationale for its reasonableness. Both the impact to the target sites and ultimately overall, provide the basis for a potential model of instruction. This is compelling.
6 points awarded.

B3 - The Center and its partner organizations in each state will sustain the project elements beyond the grant period as part of their established missions. The Center is a national nonprofit organization with a long-term mission to promote an enlightened and responsible citizenry committed to democratic principles and actively engaged in their democracy. The Center maintains a full-time program, publications, information technology, and administrative staff to fulfill its mission. Through its staff, online presence, and the assistance of partner organizations, programmatic resources and support are continually provided to teachers throughout the country regardless of external funding. Both prior work and organizational capacity demonstrate how the applicant will incorporate the work into their operations.

B3 - The independently funded WTP state partners will incorporate all project results and lessons learned into their ongoing work with teacher preparation programs, districts, schools, teachers, and other partners across their states.
6 points awarded.

B4 - The findings of formative and summative evaluation of all major aspects of the project will be available to other organizations through the Center's (www.civiced.org) and the CERL's websites (cerl.georgetown.edu). The Center will maintain a CEAS project webpage that will describe the program, highlight key impacts, report research results, identify related organizations, and link to the online PD and instructional resources on Learn.civiced.org. As with JMLP, the Center will actively work to promote the dissemination of the reports through mass-media press releases, social media networks, and the established media of national educational organizations, such as the Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional

Learning (CASEL), National Education Association, American Federation of Teachers, Council of Great City Schools, Council of Chief State School Officers, American Association of School Administrators, National Association of Secondary School Principals, and NCSS.

P. 31

6 points awarded

Weaknesses:

- B1 – no weakness noted.
- B2 – no weakness noted.
- B3 – no weakness noted.
- B3 – no weakness noted.
- B4 – no weakness noted.

Reader's Score: 25

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. 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 extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.

(10 points)

(ii) 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.

(10 points)

Please provide Overview Statement on top of first Strength comment.

Strengths:

The goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the project are clearly specified and measurable, as described in the application narrative. The applicant proposes a compelling management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget. The plan includes clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing the project tasks.

Supporting Statements:

Strengths:

C1 - The principal goals of the project are (1) to increase the achievement of underserved students in grades 4–8 on objective tests and other measures of the attainment of state civics standards, related literacy standards, and SEL competencies, (2) to create inclusive, supportive, unbiased, and identity-safe learning environments for underserved students in grades 4–8, (3) to support high-quality development for diverse elementary and middle grades teachers across the nation and across the continuum of their careers (including preparation, professional learning, and teacher leadership), and (4) to study the effectiveness of the updated and enhanced WTP blended-learning PD program at improving teacher and student outcomes in grades 4–8. P. 32.

C1 – In addition to strong goals, the applicant proposes specific objectives, and quantified outcomes to support the management of the project. The management plan includes an alignment of objectives to goals. P. 35

Both sections represent clearly specified and measurable goals, objectives, and outcomes.
10 points awarded

C2 – The pyramidal implementation system for the CEAS program, which was also used in JMLP. It includes (1) a project director with support staff at the Center, (2) a project team composed of Center staff who will monitor programmatic and fiscal compliance in fifty states and the District of Columbia and provide ongoing technical assistance, (3) fifty-one state coordinators affiliated with organizations in the Center's national network (District of Columbia included), (4) 100 or more school-district coordinators appointed by their administrations, (5) 1,350 teachers, and (6) 65,700 students over the project period. P. 31.

Milestones, timelines, and key personnel are aligned with project objectives on p. 36 – 37.

C2 - The application presents a clearly achievable management plan for its implementation.
10 points awarded.

Weaknesses:

C1 – no weaknesses noted

C2 – no weaknesses noted

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (20 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, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the WWC standards with or without reservations as described in the WWC Handbook.

(4 points)

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

(4 points)

(iii) 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.

(4 points)

(iv) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on Relevant Outcomes.

(4 points)

(v) 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.

(4 points)

Please provide Overview Statement on top of first Strength comment.

Strengths:

The applicant proposes methods of evaluation that will produce evidence of the project's effectiveness that meet WWC standards with or without reservations. Further, the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and periodic assessment of progress towards achieving the intended outcomes. The evaluation plan uses objective performance measures, will produce both quantitative and qualitative data, and will provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes. The design for implementing and evaluating the proposed project will result in possible replication of the project activities or strategies.

Supporting Statements:**Strengths:**

D1 The project evaluation will determine whether the PD program has a demonstrable effect on in-service and pre-service teachers' (1) subject-area knowledge in civics and American government, (2) classroom instructional methods, (3) incorporation of SEL competencies into the curriculum, (4) professional satisfaction and retention, and (5) ongoing participation in learning communities to enhance their professional practices. Student assessments will measure (1) acquisition of civic knowledge, skills, and dispositions, (2) development of SEL competencies, and (3) gains in general literacy in the civics context. The research team will assess the fidelity of the program's implementation. This section includes evaluation schedules.

p. 37 Clearly the research approach lends itself to the procedures necessary for sound evidence in effectiveness that will meet standards and in this reviewers opinion is aligned to the proposed project design.

D1 The applicant proposes to evaluate all three co-horts, with a combination of qualitative and quantitative methods, and that consist of 1) multi-site, school level, randomized controlled trials (RCT) based on surveys of impact, 2) single case pilot study of pre-service teachers, 3) semi-structured, in depth interviews with teacher participants, 4) ethnographies of summer institutes, and 5) classroom ethnographies, and 6) qualitative content analysis of student's written work.

P 38

D1 The applicant proposes research questions that guide the evaluation, p. 39. In addition, there are approximation to ascertain that the research is "sufficiently powered." The applicant indicates steps to minimize school, teacher, and student attrition. P. 40.

4 points awarded

D2 - Data collection and reporting strategies are timed to provide ongoing feedback to the Center to facilitate real-time adjustments. CERL will provide frequent updates to the Center, state coordinators, and other key personnel about the performance-tracking data and the results of the evaluation research, including short executive summaries to be readily distributed. CERL will time interim and full-cohort reports to coincide with completing the quantitative impact evaluation phases. The Center will host a yearly conference for coordinators, mentor teachers, and expert consultants to share information and focus on best practices. (p. 42)

D2 – the applicant proposes analysis of project fidelity. The evaluation will assess the implementation fidelity of the project components, mediators, and outcomes, including measurable thresholds for acceptable implementation. The implementation study will employ relevant elements of the framework developed by Kawass, Bloom, and Brock (2014), focusing on content, quantity, quality, and conveyance. CERL will (1) confirm and track the implementation of the PD program in all participating sites, (2) track the number of schools, teachers, and students participating in the PD program to confirm that target numbers are enrolled, and (3) track the outcomes related to the recruitment and retention of mentors prepared to implement the program. (p. 42).

4 points awarded

D3 – The applicant proposes objective measures for both teachers (p. 42-43) and students (p. 43)

4 points awarded

D4 – The applicant proposes methods to ensure valid and reliable data (p. 44), and triangulation of data to ensure consistency and data sufficiency (p. 44).

4 points awarded

D5 – the applicant proposes that all intervention, research and evaluation methods will be documented and made in a form that facilitates replication (p. 46)

4 points awarded

Weaknesses:

D1 – no weaknesses noted

D2 – no weaknesses noted

D3 – no weaknesses noted

D4 – no weaknesses noted

D5 - no weaknesses noted

Reader's Score: 20

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1

1. Competitive Preference Priority 1: Increasing Educator Diversity (Up to 5 points)

Under this priority, applicants must develop projects that are designed to improve the recruitment, outreach, preparation, support, development, and retention of a diverse educator workforce through adopting, implementing, or expanding high-quality, comprehensive teacher preparation programs that have a track record of attracting, supporting, graduating, and placing underrepresented teacher candidates, and that include one year of high-quality clinical experiences (prior to becoming the teacher of record) in high-need schools.

Strengths:

Over three years, the project intends to (1) increase the number of highly effective and diverse teachers in grades 4–8 by providing professional preparation and support to 1,350 teachers, including at least 50% teachers of color; (2) increase the achievement of at least 65,7003 students in attaining state standards in civics, relevant ELA standards, and SEL competencies; (3) provide professional preparation and support to teachers working in at least 400 schools with significant populations of underserved students; and (4) evaluate the effectiveness of the WTP PD and curricular programs, utilizing the blended-learning PD model demonstrated to be effective in JMLP and strengthened with new, targeted resources and methods for grades 4–8.

p. 4

Weaknesses:

The applicant lacks a plan for achieving the target.

Reader's Score: 4

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 2

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 2: Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities
(up to 3 points)**

Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate that the applicant proposes a project designed to promote educational equity and adequacy in resources and opportunity for Underserved Students—

(1) In one or more of the following educational settings:

- (i) Early learning programs.**
- (ii) Elementary school.**
- (iii) Middle school.**
- (iv) High school.**
- (v) Career and technical education programs.**
- (vi) Out-of-school-time settings.**
- (vii) Alternative schools and programs.**
- (viii) Juvenile justice system or correctional facilities;**

(2) That examines the sources of inequity and inadequacy and implements responses that include pedagogical practices in Educator preparation programs and professional development programs that are inclusive with regard to race, ethnicity, culture, language, and disability status so that educators are better prepared to create inclusive, supportive, equitable, unbiased, and identity-safe learning environments for their students.

Strengths:

Over three years, the project intends to (1) increase the number of highly effective and diverse teachers in grades 4–8 by providing professional preparation and support to 1,350 teachers, including at least 50% teachers of color; (2) increase the achievement of at least 65,7003 students in attaining state standards in civics, relevant ELA standards, and SEL competencies; (3) provide professional preparation and support to teachers working in at least 400 schools with significant populations of underserved students; and (4) evaluate the effectiveness of the WTP PD and curricular programs, utilizing the blended-learning PD model demonstrated to be effective in JMLP and strengthened with new, targeted resources and methods for grades 4–8.

Page 4

Weaknesses:

None

Reader's Score: 3

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 3

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 3: Meeting Student Social, Emotional, and Academic Needs
(up to 2 points)**

Projects that are designed to improve students' social, emotional, academic, and career development, with a focus on Underserved Students, through developing and supporting

Educator and school capacity to support social and emotional learning and development that—

- (1) Fosters skills and behaviors that enable academic progress;**
- (2) Identifies and addresses conditions in the learning environment, that may negatively impact social and emotional well-being for Underserved Students, including conditions that affect physical safety; and**
- (3) Is trauma-informed, such as addressing exposure to community-based violence and trauma specific to Military- or Veteran-Connected Students.**

Strengths:

Over three years, the project intends to (1) increase the number of highly effective and diverse teachers in grades 4–8 by providing professional preparation and support to 1,350 teachers, including at least 50% teachers of color; (2) increase the achievement of at least 65,7003 students in attaining state standards in civics, relevant ELA standards, and SEL competencies; (3) provide professional preparation and support to teachers working in at least 400 schools with significant populations of underserved students; and (4) evaluate the effectiveness of the WTP PD and curricular programs, utilizing the blended-learning PD model demonstrated to be effective in JMLP and strengthened with new, targeted resources and methods for grades 4–8.

Page 4

Weaknesses:

none

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/14/2022 02:36 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/13/2022 01:40 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Center for Civic Education (S423A220078)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	35	33
Significance		
1. Significance	25	25
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	20
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
Sub Total	100	98
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. Educator Diversity	5	4
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
1. Promoting Equity	3	3
Competitive Preference Priority 3		
1. Meeting Student Needs	2	2
Sub Total	10	9
Total	110	107

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - FY22 SEED Panel - 1: 84.423A

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Center for Civic Education (S423A220078)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. A. Quality of Project Design (35 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 training or professional development services to be provided by the proposed project are of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration to lead to improvements in practice among the recipients of those services.
(7 points)

(ii) 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.(7 points)

(iii) The extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework.
(7 points)

(iv) 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.
(7 points)

(v) The extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs.
(7 points)

Please provide Overview Statement on top of first Strength comment.

Strengths:

The applicant provides details regarding the overview of the proposal indicating the project innovates and improves the Center's We the People: PD and curricular program in the upper elementary and middle grades (4-8) to meet the needs of today's diverse educators and learners. The applicant provided sufficient details regarding the professional development services that will be supported by the proposed project. Clarity is provided to determine the extent of intensity and duration of the PD that will lead to improvement in practice for the intended participants. The applicant does provide clarity around building capacity of participants. The applicant provides limited evidence to which the results will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance is provided.

The applicant provides a clearly defined conceptual framework underlying the proposed research activities. There is sufficient evidence to support the planned project and the involvement of collaborative partners for maximizing the effectiveness of the project. Additionally, the applicant provides adequate discussion on the needs of the targeted area and population.

i. Sufficient evidence is proved for professional development services. The applicant provides evidence of its effectiveness stating that over 60 empirical research studies have consistently reported on the Center's programs for teachers and students (e22). The applicant provides sufficient evidence of the intensity and duration of the program. For example, the applicant states that over 1000 teachers will be recruited to participate and provided the number of teacher participants each year of grant implementation. The applicant also provides the number of hours of PD the summer and academic year the participants will receive (e23). Furthermore, the applicant provided a Cohort model for each year

expectation of professional development hours (e23). Also, online PD courses and culminating teamwork activities will be provided to the participants (e-28).

ii. Sufficient evidence is noted to support how the proposed project will build capacity and yield results. For example, the applicant provides annual PD goals that are aligned with district standards and goals for Civics, ELA, and SEL (e31). The applicant provides details to support the sustainability of the program by stating that experienced mentors will work with new mentors to develop skills to provide the PD to teachers in future years (e32). Also, the applicant provides evidence with the institutionalization of the teacher prep program. For example, the applicant will partner with other residency programs to implement the WTP professional learning (e32). The applicant also suggests that after the conclusion of the grant, CEAS teachers will continue to have access to coordinator and mentor support (e33).

iii. The applicant provides a conceptual framework that depicts the project activities (e33). The provided Logic Model includes (existing conditions, goals, inputs, actions, outcomes- both short and long term (e33).

iv. The applicant clearly states how the project will involve collaboration of partners for effectiveness of the services. On (e34), the applicant lists the partners and the roles each will play during project implementation. Some of the partners include, National consultants, state partner organizations, districts, schools and teacher prep programs, (e35) In-state consultants, etc.

v. The applicant adequately identifies the targeted populations and how the needs will be addressed. For instance, the applicant states that the CEAS PD program will address the need to improve the content knowledge and instructional strategies of teachers working with underserved students to bridge civic achievement, and opportunity gaps between high-need and more advantaged students (e36). Additionally, the applicant states that CEAS will provide professional preparation and support to teachers in credentialing programs and those already working in high need schools (e37). Also, the applicant explained the need for civic education among underserved students (e37).

Weaknesses:

i. None noted.

ii. The applicant has limited evidence in other areas of sustainability after federal funding is expended. For example, how will the services rendered be compensated? 2 points deducted

iii. None noted.

iv. None noted.

v. None noted.

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. B. Significance (25 points)

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

(i) The importance or magnitude of the results or outcomes likely to be attained by the proposed project, especially improvements in teaching and student achievement.
(7 points)

(ii) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the number of persons to be served and to the anticipated results and benefits.
(6 points)

(iii) 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.
(6 points)

(iv) 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.
(6 points)

Please provide Overview Statement on top of first Strength comment.

Strengths:

The significance and importance of results and outcomes likely to be attained by the project is outlined in nine areas. The applicant provided an overview detailing the results and outcomes for the project and provided a table graphing the dissemination of the details of the project. There is sufficient evidence to suggest that the extent of the costs is reasonable in relation to the number of persons to be served and the applicant provides evidence that the project's activities will extend beyond the end of Federal funding.

i. Evidence provided by the applicant regarding impact is clearly stated. For example, the proposal provides the impact of civic education on students (e39), the importance of the CEAS program because it evaluates the WTP PD program in grades 4-8 in fifty states and DC with the potential to improve equitable access and learning outcomes for underserved students in the areas of civics, literacy, and SEL (e40). Also, increasing literacy achievement is stated by the applicant by implementing the WTP curriculum intentionally embeds literacy in social studies and develops literacy skills, fostering attainment of ELA standards.

ii. Sufficient information was provided to support reasonable costs for the number of persons served and the anticipated results. For example, the applicant states that CEAS will provide 1,350 participating teachers with fifty-two hours of PD and ongoing support (e43-44). The applicant provided background of the Center's ability to implement federal funds successfully. For instance, the applicant states that since 1965, and managing more than \$300 million dollars, they have had the ability to achieve project goals (e44).

iii. The applicant states that the project results and lessons learned will continue to be independently funded by their existing partners (e45). Also, the applicant states that the partners will maintain contact with CEAS teachers to share new opportunities for professional growth and educational leadership (e45).

The applicant provided adequate details to support the potential for incorporation of project activities and benefits into ongoing programs. For example, the applicant states that the existing staff, online presence and partner organizations are continually provided to teachers throughout the country regardless of external funding (e45). In addition, the applicant provided a narrative about the extension of the work from WTP network and the incorporation of CEAS into activities as

well as a continuation and expansion of online communities and resources.

iv. Adequate details are provided by the applicant to support the extent to which the results of the proposed project will be disseminated. For instance, the applicant states that the Center in collaboration with state organizations in its network, will develop a comprehensive report to the U. S. Department of Education on the project's results, outcomes, and strategies each year (e46).

Additionally, the applicant stated that their findings will be visible on their webpage highlighting key impacts, etc. (e47).

Weaknesses:

- i. None noted.
- ii. None noted.
- iii. None noted.
- iv. None noted.

Reader's Score: 25

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. 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 extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.

(10 points)

(ii) 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.

(10 points)

Please provide Overview Statement on top of first Strength comment.

Strengths:

The applicant provided a pyramidal implementation system overview for the CEAS program which includes the staffing, the project team, the state coordinators, teachers and students during the project period (e48). The applicant addressed the quality of the management plan by providing a logic model including partners, four SMART goals, objectives, activities, short and long-term outcomes that are appropriately outlined to accomplish the project's tasks. Additionally, the applicant provides an adequate management plan that is suitably developed. The provided management plan, if well implemented, can be achieved on time and within the budget. Key personnel are listed in the narrative.

- i. The applicant provided a Pyramidal management and Implementation System graph (e49). Additionally, there is a

narrative provided to address the specification and measurability of goals, objectives and outcomes. For instance, there are two goals presented: to increase the achievement of underserved students in grades 4-8 and to create inclusive, supportive, to study the effectiveness of the updated and enhanced WTP blended-learning PD.... (e49).

ii. There is adequate information to support the management plan provided by the applicant. For example, the applicant states that the Center will implement CEAS working with other partners. Also, the applicant provides five steps the center will take to facilitate the functioning of the project (e52). Key personnel are also provided by the applicant in Table 2: Key Personnel and Table 3: lists the Milestones, lead responsible party and timeline for the management plan (e53).

Weaknesses:

i. None noted.

ii. None noted.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (20 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, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the WWC standards with or without reservations as described in the WWC Handbook.

(4 points)

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

(4 points)

(iii) 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.

(4 points)

(iv) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on Relevant Outcomes.

(4 points)

(v) 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.

(4 points)

Please provide Overview Statement on top of first Strength comment.

Strengths:

The applicant provides an overview of the project's evaluation on the effect of PD on in-service and pre-service for teachers (e54) in five areas which clearly describes a significant impact that is likely to be attained by the proposed project, especially improvements in teaching and student achievement. Additionally, the applicant provides student

assessments and how they will be measured(e55). The applicant states that researchers will evaluate three project cohorts (e55). Also, adequate evidence of how the applicant plans to disseminate in ways that information can be replicated by others is provided in the narrative.

i. The application includes 6 core research questions (e56). The applicant states that the research team will assess impact of the CEAS PD on in-service with the project goals using a multi-side design to meet WWC standards (e56). The applicant states that variables, control groups, potential for study contamination will be taken into consideration to determine quantitative impact(e56). The application indicates that schools will be assigned by chance and any differences in assignment probabilities will be adjusted as specified by the WWC (e57).

ii. The applicant provided details on the performance feedback and periodic assessment of progress. As indicated in 2.1 (e59), the applicant shared that frequent update will be provided to the Center, state coordinators and other key personnel for performance tracking of the data. Additionally, the applicant stated that the implementation of the study will employ elements of the framework developed by researchers that will focus on the content, and conveyance of the project. Interim and full-cohort reports will be provided, and the Center will host annual conferences for key stakeholders as indicated in the proposal (e59).

iii. The applicant provided performance measures in three areas: Teacher and student measures as well as surveys (e60.)

iv. The applicant stated that the validity and reliability of the performance data will be established through methods defined by the WWC standards for outcome measures (e61). Additionally, the application indicates that the reliability of the measures for the study will meet the WWC requirements for maximum allowable random measurement error. Furthermore, the applicant states that triangulation of the various research strategies in the study will be employed to determine if the findings are consistent and to assess the data's sufficiency (e61). The applicant further states that there will be a qualitative component (semi-structured teacher interviews - e62) to provide evidence for evaluating the validity of the quantitative measures (e61).

v. The applicant provided sufficient details on how the project design results will guide replication, such as, the creation of research reports (e63), and the dissemination plan will be accessible for researchers and other stakeholders on the CERL website and available through Georgetown University's secure repository (e64).

Weaknesses:

i. None noted.

ii. None noted.

iii. None noted.

iv. None noted.

v. None noted.

Reader's Score: 20

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1

1. Competitive Preference Priority 1: Increasing Educator Diversity (Up to 5 points)

Under this priority, applicants must develop projects that are designed to improve the recruitment, outreach, preparation, support, development, and retention of a diverse educator workforce through adopting, implementing, or expanding high-quality, comprehensive teacher preparation programs that have a track record of attracting, supporting, graduating, and placing underrepresented teacher candidates, and that include one year of high-quality clinical experiences (prior to becoming the teacher of record) in high-need schools.

Strengths:

Over three years, the project intends to (1) increase the number of highly effective and diverse teachers in grades 4–8 by providing professional preparation and support to 1,350 teachers, including at least 50% teachers of color; (2) increase the achievement of at least 65,7003 students in attaining state standards in civics, relevant ELA standards, and SEL competencies; (3) provide professional preparation and support to teachers working in at least 400 schools with significant populations of underserved students (e21).

Weaknesses:

The applicant lacks a plan for achieving the targets. Additionally, there is limited data on how they will recruit these teachers is provided in the narrative. There is also no evidence to determine how the targeted schools with underserved populations will be selected. 1 point deducted

Reader's Score: 4

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 2

1. Competitive Preference Priority 2: Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities (up to 3 points)

Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate that the applicant proposes a project designed to promote educational equity and adequacy in resources and opportunity for Underserved Students—

(1) In one or more of the following educational settings:

- (i) Early learning programs.
- (ii) Elementary school.
- (iii) Middle school.
- (iv) High school.
- (v) Career and technical education programs.
- (vi) Out-of-school-time settings.
- (vii) Alternative schools and programs.
- (viii) Juvenile justice system or correctional facilities;

(2) That examines the sources of inequity and inadequacy and implements responses that

include pedagogical practices in Educator preparation programs and professional development programs that are inclusive with regard to race, ethnicity, culture, language, and disability status so that educators are better prepared to create inclusive, supportive, equitable, unbiased, and identity-safe learning environments for their students.

Strengths:

CEAS will increase the number of diverse and highly effective teachers in high-need upper elementary and middle schools, thereby increasing equitable access to quality instruction for underserved students. It will provide teachers with professional learning and support to implement WTP effectively and in an inclusive manner in their classrooms (e24). Evaluating equity issues in their classrooms and how to promote an inclusive, unbiased, and identity-safe environment for academic learning that addresses community-based violence, trauma, and other social and emotional barriers that students face e27.

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 3

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 3

1. Competitive Preference Priority 3: Meeting Student Social, Emotional, and Academic Needs (up to 2 points)

Projects that are designed to improve students' social, emotional, academic, and career development, with a focus on Underserved Students, through developing and supporting Educator and school capacity to support social and emotional learning and development that—

- (1) Fosters skills and behaviors that enable academic progress;
- (2) Identifies and addresses conditions in the learning environment, that may negatively impact social and emotional well-being for Underserved Students, including conditions that affect physical safety; and
- (3) Is trauma-informed, such as addressing exposure to community-based violence and trauma specific to Military- or Veteran-Connected Students.

Strengths:

The applicant states that the WTP fosters competencies across the SEL framework: (1) self-awareness, (2) social awareness, (3) responsible decision-making, (4) self-management, and (5) relationship management (Balfanz and Byrnes 2020; Zins et al. 2007).

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/13/2022 01:40 PM

