

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/04/2023 02:49 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Marquette University (S422B230050)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	20	20
Need for Project		
1. Need	25	25
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	25	23
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Adequacy of Resources	30	26
Sub Total	100	94
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
Innovative Activities for Civic Engagement		
1. Civic Engagement	5	5
Sub Total	5	5
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
Student Access to Resources and Opportunities		
1. Promoting Equity	7	7
Sub Total	7	7
Total	112	106

Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - AHC-NA - 5: 84.422B

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Marquette University (S422B230050)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. 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. (10 points)
 - (ii) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priority or priorities established for the competition. (10 points)

Strengths:

Strengths:

The proposal is an exceptional approach as it will provide professional learning that is "a place-based, inquiry-centered approach to the history and civic engagement of Milwaukee's communities" in the context of US history with the goal of transforming students into "change agents, community contributors, and citizens who matter." (p. e14)

This approach contrast with current practice that is focused on test results: "This is an innovative approach because most civics instruction in Wisconsin remains focused on the memorization of content that appears on the state civics exam rather than engaging as citizens now." (p. e16)

The proposal includes a logic model that discusses in detail how the program will work and articulates the project's outcomes over a five year periods . The logic model expresses the assumptions, resources (tangible and intangible), strategies/activities, outputs, short-term outcomes (1-2 years), intermediary outcomes (3-4 years), and long-term outcomes (5+ years). (p. e66) The proposal includes a management plan that presents how the program will work over 3 years and includes date, activity description, milestones & deliverables, leaders/participants. (pp. e312-325)

The project through its logic model and management demonstrates that its goals and objectives are of high quality by being specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-bound.

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Need for Project

1. 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. (8 points)
 - 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. (7 points)

iii. The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project are focused on those with greatest needs. (10 points)

Strengths:

Overview:

The proposal describes the magnitude the problem to be addressed and focuses on those with the greatest need. The proposal identifies the specific gaps and weaknesses in services, infrastructure, and opportunities and describes they will be addressed by the project.

Supporting Statements:

Strengths:

The proposal state it "is designed specifically to engage the young people in our city's schools, who are predominantly from economically disadvantaged backgrounds and overwhelmingly identify as youth of color." (p. e32)

The proposal presents the accountability data on Milwaukee Public Schools and its poor academic performance: "In 2021-2022, Milwaukee Public Schools—the largest school district in Wisconsin, serving 69,115—was rated on the Wisconsin DPI State Report Card as "Meeting Few Expectations," one of only 19 districts of the state's 377 not to meet or exceed expectations." (p. e34) It also notes that Wisconsin has "one of the worst academic discrepancies between Black and White students." (p. e34) Recent studies show that "The city of Milwaukee itself, while diversifying, remains one of the most segregated in the nation." (p. e36)

The proposal notes that schools are not help students understand their city, as "school history and civics curricula continue to teach a national narrative without immediate relevance to our Milwaukee history and present day." (p. e37) Wisconsin's Model Academic Standards do not explicitly contain local history and the focus of local history, when taught, is on "the three "founding fathers" of Milwaukee (Solomon Juneau, Byron Kilbourn, and George Walker). (p. e38) with the result being "that Milwaukee's communities are actively excluded from the narratives of nation-making and social change." (p. e39)

The proposal focuses on students of poverty and the most needy and describes two partner school systems: "Milwaukee Public Schools' student population is both economically disadvantaged (80%), and overwhelmingly Black (50.3%) and Latinx (27.8%). St Joan Antida High School, which a private choice school, serves students who are 97% economically disadvantaged, 62% Latinx, and 32% Black." (p. e40)

The proposal describes how it will address these issue: "Our theory of action—supported by research evidence elsewhere—is that our young people's understanding of themselves as civic actors and community members can be transformed if they understand their communities as rich sites of history, organizing, resistance, and joy." (pp. e30-31) The project's goal is to develop curricular materials and engage students as future citizens: "[B]y developing curricular materials and teacher learning opportunities in place-based education, we seek to make Milwaukee's rich history and present day a foundation for civics and history learning—and in so doing, provide opportunities for young people to identify and act as community citizens." (p. e31)

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 25

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. 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. (13 points)

ii. The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project. (12 points)

Strengths:

Overview:

The management plan explains in detail how the project will achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks. The proposal includes procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.

Supporting Statements:

Strengths:

The management plan is described in two ways. There is a summary narrative (pp. e41-43) and an extensive table that includes date, activity description, milestones & deliverables, leaders/participants. (pp. e312-325)

The proposal describes the objectives as "(1) create and curate curricular resources that will be freely available to the Milwaukee community to facilitate the teaching of local history; (2) build teacher capacity to teach contextually relevant local history and civics in connection with macro-level narratives and Wisconsin state standards; and (3) ultimately, improve student engagement and achievement." (p. e41) The plan describes weaving together 4 parts, Summer Institute, Pedagogical Ecosystem, Community of Practice, Research & Evaluation. (p. e41)

The project has existing staff with "expertise in local history, student-centered pedagogies, and research methodologies" and additional community partners knowledgeable in local history and pedagogy. (p. e42)

The proposal describes its plan for continuous improvement: "Formal program evaluation occurs annually during the final quarter of the grant year, but additional mechanisms are in place for continuous feedback." This process relies on a research and evaluation team of three members: Dr. Blake O'Neal Turner, a critical quantitative methodologist in education; dr. derria byrd, a qualitative methodologist in education; and Dr. Melissa Gibson (PI), a pedagogical researcher. (p.e44) While academic data such as test scores and classroom will be utilized, there will also be an examination of "persistence and engagement measures such as attendance, truancy, and work completion rates." (pp. e44-45) In addition, there will be classroom observations: "we plan to conduct two-week observational cycles in participating classrooms that agree to participate." (p. e46) Other methods include survey data from participants in Summer institutes. (p. e47) The information will be disseminated first in terms of the ongoing work and then presented at national conferences on social studies and educational research. (p. e47)

Weaknesses:

The proposal discusses the need to hire a full-time Program Manager. While the position is justifiable, the timeline for hiring is November/December 2023 and difficulty in finding a person may delay meeting project timelines and goals. (p. e42) The position is budgeted for \$50,000 (p. e332) and this may not be enough as this is a "key component" and funding may need to be adjusted to \$75,000-100,000.

Reader's Score: 23

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

1. The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources for the proposed project. In determining the quality of the adequacy of resources, the Secretary considers the following factors:

i. The adequacy of support, including facilities, equipment, supplies, and other resources, from the applicant organization or the lead applicant organization. (6 points)

- ii. **The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project. (8 points)**
- iii. **The extent to which the applicant demonstrates that it has the resources to operate the project beyond the length of the grant, including a multiyear financial and operating model and accompanying plan; the demonstrated commitment of any partners; evidence of broad support from stakeholders (e.g., SEAs, LEAs, teachers' unions) critical to the project's long-term success; or more than one of these types of evidence. (8 points)**
- iv. **The relevance and demonstrated commitment of each partner in the proposed project to the implementation and success of the project. (8 points)**

Strengths:

Overview:

The project will be well supported, including facilities, equipment, supplies, and other resources, from the applicant organization or the lead applicant organization. The costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project. The applicant demonstrates that it has the resources to operate the project beyond the length of the grant, including a multiyear financial and operating model and accompanying plan; the demonstrated commitment of any partners; evidence of broad support from stakeholders critical to the project's long-term success. The proposal includes demonstrated commitment of each partner in the proposed project to the implementation and success of the project.

Supporting Statements:

Strengths:

The proposal describes the host institution, Marquette University (MU), as supportive in the mission of the project (embraces the teacher-scholar model and that deeply values community engagement), flexible in personnel (course releases for faculty), generous in facilities use (the Summer Institute and Community of Practice in-person meetings will be hosted in MU spaces). (p. e48)

In addition, the project has additional "community partners such as America's Black Holocaust Museum, Milwaukee Public Schools, St Joan Antida High School, and Vel Phillips Juvenile Justice Center" who can provide additional resources such as meeting spaces, contracts with bus services, and teaching resources. (p. e48)

The proposal includes letters of commitment from all of its partners. (p. e299-312) One noteworthy letter comes from Dr. Keith Posly, Superintendent of Milwaukee Public Schools. (pp. e300-301) The project also includes a list of its educators network. (p. e326)

The total budget request is \$1,271,122 over a three year period and is reasonable. The proposal apologetically describes its need to use bus transportation but the cost is only \$4500/year. (p. e50)

Weaknesses:

The applicant states it has the resources to operate the project beyond the length of the grant because of its partnership with the Center for Urban Research, Teaching and Outreach (CURTO). The curriculum "will be built and shared during the life of Department of Education funding, and it will be hosted in perpetuity by CURTO." (p. e52) However, the proposal does not provide a timeline of future actions and a specific discussion of potential revenues and future budgets to sustain the project.

Reader's Score: 26

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority 1 - Innovative Activities for Civic Engagement

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

Under this priority, we provide funding to promote new and existing evidence-based strategies to encourage innovative civics and government learning strategies and professional development activities and programs for teachers, principals, or other school leaders, particularly such instruction, strategies, activities, and programs that benefit low income students and underserved populations. To meet this priority, a project must 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.

Strengths:

Overview:

The project includes hands-on civic engagement activities for teachers and students and programs that educate students about the history and principles of the Constitution of the United States, including the Bill of Rights.

Supporting Statements:

Strengths:

The proposed project describes itself as "a professional development program that gives teachers the necessary tools, both pedagogical and disciplinary, to teach history and civics in ways that center the contributions of communities often forgotten in the larger historical narrative of Milwaukee and the US." (p. e13) The goal is to "equip teachers with pedagogical approaches that invite students to learn social studies content and act civically at the same time." (p. e14) In learning about their local history, student will understand how U.S. and local history and civil rights struggles intersect: "[S]tudents may learn about leaders from their own communities, such as mother-activist Juanita Adams, who led protests against MPS's continued school segregation after Brown v. Board." (p. e15) In addition, the proposal wants "students to see themselves as important civic agents, part of a long lineage of community members shaping Milwaukee." (p. e16)

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Competitive Preference Priority 2 - Student Access to Resources and Opportunities

1. Competitive Preference Priority 2: Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities (up to 7 points)

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

a) in one or more of the following educational settings: (1) Early learning programs (2) Elementary school (3) Middle school (4) High school (5) Career and technical education programs(6) Out-of-schooltime settings (7) Alternative schools and programs (8) Juvenile justice system or correctional facilities

b) That examines the sources of inequity and inadequacy and implement responses, and that may include one or both of the following:

c) Rigorous, engaging, and well-rounded (e.g., that include music and the arts) approaches to learning that are inclusive with regard to race, ethnicity, culture, language, and disability status and prepare students for college, career, and civic life, including civics programs that support students in understanding and engaging in American democratic practices (up to 3 points).

d) Establishing, expanding, or improving the engagement of underserved community members

(including underserved students and families) in informing and making decisions that influence policy and practice at the school, district, or State level by elevating their voices, through their participation and their perspectives and providing them with access to opportunities for leadership (e.g., establishing partnerships between civic student government programs and parent and caregiver leadership initiatives) (up to 4 points).

Strengths:

The applicant proposes a project designed to promote educational equity and adequacy in resources and opportunity for underserved student in middle school and high school. Using rigorous, engaging, and well-rounded approaches to learning, the proposed project is inclusive with regard to race, ethnicity, and culture, and will prepare students for understanding and engaging in American democratic practices

The project seeks to stablish, expand, and improve the engagement of underserved community members so that they can elevate their voice and participate in shaping policy and practice at the school, district, or State level.

Supporting Statements:

Strengths:

The program "seeks to democratize local history by telling the stories of communities that are not typically included in official history curricula. In Milwaukee, that specifically means our communities of color and our indigenous communities." (p. e16) The proposal states, "Milwaukee Public Schools and its collection of choice schools serve predominantly low-income students and students of color and remain underfunded, and underperforming compared to the rest of the state and the nation." (p. e17) To address, the proposal call for pedagogical ecosystem "that is designed specifically for Milwaukee's students and communities, and which specifically prioritizes our Black, Latinx, and Indigenous communities." (p. e17) At the same time there is "the demographic mismatch between teachers (who are majority White) and students (who are predominantly BIPOC." The proposed project "seeks to address these challenges to equity by improving teachers' pedagogical and content knowledge in both history and civics so that they are more able to engage students in critical and contextually relevant learning." (p. e17)

The proposed project "offers opportunities for young people to engage as community contributors now. . . by collecting oral histories of community elders, designing digital monument markers to draw attention to the contributions of our communities of color, or creating digital media that answers the question, 'How should we tell the story of our Milwaukee?'" The study of Milwaukee's history and community draws "direct line between the learning of history and the actions of an engaged citizen." (p. e31)

Weaknesses:

None noted

Reader's Score: 7

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/04/2023 02:49 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/07/2023 09:22 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Marquette University (S422B230050)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	20	20
Need for Project		
1. Need	25	25
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	25	24
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Adequacy of Resources	30	24
Sub Total	100	93
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
Innovative Activities for Civic Engagement		
1. Civic Engagement	5	5
Sub Total	5	5
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
Student Access to Resources and Opportunities		
1. Promoting Equity	7	7
Sub Total	7	7
Total	112	105

Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - AHC-NA - 5: 84.422B

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Marquette University (S422B230050)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. 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. (10 points)

(ii) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priority or priorities established for the competition. (10 points)

Strengths:

Overview: The application provides MKE Roots, MKE Roots Summer Institute and Roots Community of Practice within a well supported high quality project design. It includes an extensive support of the rationale and multiple examples of how the project will uniquely address the priorities of the competition.

i. The applicant provides a clearly demonstrated rationale by addressing the needs for professional development for Milwaukee area teachers and economically disadvantaged, Latinx and African American students (e18, e33).

It emphasizes the failures of the city towards young people of color with disproportionate poverty, incarceration and disenfranchisement. The rationale for the project's emphasis on local history, community action and civic education (e14, e18, e33).

ii. The applicant provides substantial evidence of the target audience which are minority students and teachers of those students in the Milwaukee area.

The project also details the challenges which makes this project necessary including limited human capital and educational resources, political division, discriminatory policies, and disconnect from Milwaukee's rich history (e35-37).

The applicant extensively details how the project seeks to resolve those issues through the place based learning which places students in their communities, where historical narratives of equality and prosperity occurred. The teacher training in the MKE Roots component of the program helps transform teachers' approach to instruction and provide continuous support to reach this goal.

The project provides an exceptional approach to the priorities by supplying student engagement, critical thinking and problem-solving skills to the target population (e18-33).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Need for Project

1. 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. (8 points)
 - 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. (7 points)
 - iii. The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project are focused on those with greatest needs. (10 points)

Strengths:

Overview: The application demonstrates a clear need for the project. The project thoroughly details the magnitude of the problem and the identified gaps. Across multiple examples, the application demonstrates how it is part of a comprehensive effort aimed at improving instruction and as well as student opportunities for growth in the present and future. The applicant's plan provides rigorous strategies aimed at successfully meeting the needs of the target population.

The applicant provided substantial demographic data of the project is designed to address. Detailing the impact poverty has on literacy.

The applicant also provides substantial evidence of the magnitude of need within the infrastructure which places the target population at a severe disadvantage. The applicant highlights the current social studies curriculum in their system. It is clear the current district curriculum has not had a thorough evaluation for an extensive period of time. This unfortunate fact supports the applicant's argument of the unrealistic expectations for graduation due to lack of substantial support and resources for educators (e33-34).

The applicant extensively details and connects the project purpose to meeting the needs of the educators and the students who will benefit from their development. The applicant also makes clear the correlation between local civic education and engagement to educators and students embracing study of civic as well as U.S. history on a larger scale (e33-38).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 25

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. 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. (13 points)
 - ii. The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project. (12 points)

Strengths:

Overview: The management plan described by the applicant is adequate to achieve the objectives of the proposed project. There is potential for success with the reasonable budget, team whose roles are clearly defined and sufficient timelines. The components which need clarity are the activities which appear to repeat the objective. There are milestones which repeat the activities instead of making clear distinction of a moment of desired accomplishment within the project.

The goals and objectives for the project are clearly detailed and achievable. The applicant has clearly defined the responsibilities of their management team which are sufficient for completing each activity of the project (e39-43). It is commendable of the applicant to utilize persons who are strongly connected and recognized in the community to develop and execute their plan. These relationships will be important when launching a new project with educators and students.

The applicant has provided substantially adequate procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement. Continuous improvement is established through providing seven modalities for obtaining feedback from stakeholders. Those methods include but are not limited to feedback loops and reflective practices as well as monitoring through the use of key performance indicators (e45-47).

Weaknesses:

The applicant should consider the salary allotment of the program manager and whether it will be an appealing salary considering the extensive responsibilities (e330, Budget Narrative).

Reader's Score: 24

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

1. **The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources for the proposed project. In determining the quality of the adequacy of resources, the Secretary considers the following factors:**
 - i. **The adequacy of support, including facilities, equipment, supplies, and other resources, from the applicant organization or the lead applicant organization. (6 points)**
 - ii. **The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project. (8 points)**
 - iii. **The extent to which the applicant demonstrates that it has the resources to operate the project beyond the length of the grant, including a multiyear financial and operating model and accompanying plan; the demonstrated commitment of any partners; evidence of broad support from stakeholders (e.g., SEAs, LEAs, teachers' unions) critical to the project's long-term success; or more than one of these types of evidence. (8 points)**
 - iv. **The relevance and demonstrated commitment of each partner in the proposed project to the implementation and success of the project. (8 points)**

Strengths:

Overview: The application has provided evidence of substantial adequacy of resources ranging from facilities, costs, support of stakeholders, ability for long-term sustainability, and partner commitment.

Marquette University is the institutional host for the MKE Roots project. It is composed of members of faculty and multiple community partners. As research 2 institution they have embraced the teacher- scholar model which deep values in community engagement embody the university's values of serving others (e48).

Milwaukee Public Schools is also a major partner in the sustainability of the project, this school district along with other valuable partners is committed to the project. There are suburban schools and other partners with a strong commitment to the project, but not limited to organizing and executing tasks. The applicant has strong leadership with experience managing multiple grants which will be an asset as they progress with the grant program. (e 48-58, Budget Narrative).

Weaknesses:

The applicant should consider increasing the teacher's stipends. Although it is stated the stipend is equivalent to one week's pay, how will it benefit the teacher who will be engaging this program along with their daily professional and personal responsibilities. It will show the teachers are valued and possibly increase continuous participation (e330, Budget Narrative).

Reader's Score: 24

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority 1 - Innovative Activities for Civic Engagement

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

Under this priority, we provide funding to promote new and existing evidence-based strategies to encourage innovative civics and government learning strategies and professional development activities and programs for teachers, principals, or other school leaders, particularly such instruction, strategies, activities, and programs that benefit low income students and underserved populations. To meet this priority, a project must 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.

Strengths:

Overview:

The application has provided substantial evidence to support their ability to provide evidence based strategies to encourage innovation in civics and government for all academic stakeholders. The program educates students from low income and underserved populations with innovative hands-on strategies and lessons.

The applicant plans to utilize professional development as well as classroom application of the place-based exploration through the MKE Roots programming. The applicant has provided substantial evidence of hands-on civic engagement activities for the students including connections to elders and entrepreneurs in their communities. The project also ensures the students will learn about U.S. History (e28-29). Students will develop relationships with the elders of the community learning their roles in several movements which occurred in their city including the Civil Rights movement which occurred in Milwaukee (e30). Often oral history is forgotten, and it has been proven to be a valuable asset to culture and civilizations, this applicant has taken a unique approach which appears to have the potential to expand the education of history for underserved students beyond their city.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Competitive Preference Priority 2 - Student Access to Resources and Opportunities

1. Competitive Preference Priority 2: Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities (up to 7 points)

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

a) in one or more of the following educational settings: (1) Early learning programs (2) Elementary school (3) Middle school (4) High school (5) Career and technical education programs (6) Out-of-schooltime settings (7) Alternative schools and programs (8) Juvenile justice system or correctional facilities

b) That examines the sources of inequity and inadequacy and implement responses, and that may include one or both of the following:

c) Rigorous, engaging, and well-rounded (e.g., that include music and the arts) approaches to learning that are inclusive with regard to race, ethnicity, culture, language, and disability status and prepare students for college, career, and civic life, including civics programs that support students in understanding and engaging in American democratic practices (up to 3 points).

d) Establishing, expanding, or improving the engagement of underserved community members (including underserved students and families) in informing and making decisions that influence policy and practice at the school, district, or State level by elevating their voices, through their participation and their perspectives and providing them with access to opportunities for leadership (e.g., establishing partnerships between civic student government programs and parent and caregiver leadership initiatives) (up to 4 points).

Strengths:

Overview:

Upon examining the sources of inequity and inadequacy, the applicant has developed a rigorous and engaging approach to learning which is inclusive and innovative.

The applicant provided substantial evidence of promoting educational equity and adequacy in resources and opportunity for underserved students particularly in rural high school settings(e32). The professional development and classroom application of project-based learning to be utilized for the civic program. It should be noted the program will have a rigorous and engaging form of instruction which is inclusive to all underserved students (e32-33). Often institutions use the term rigor to describe programs which are only replicas of traditional methods of instruction. The impressive component of this project is the ability to help students and teachers actively listen which is an essential tool when engaging oral history. It also is a form of instruction that is truly empowering to all who have the opportunity to experience it.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 7

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/07/2023 09:22 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/04/2023 10:37 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Marquette University (S422B230050)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	20	17
Need for Project		
1. Need	25	21
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	25	21
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Adequacy of Resources	30	24
Sub Total	100	83
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
Innovative Activities for Civic Engagement		
1. Civic Engagement	5	5
Sub Total	5	5
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
Student Access to Resources and Opportunities		
1. Promoting Equity	7	7
Sub Total	7	7
Total	112	95

Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - AHC-NA - 5: 84.422B

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Marquette University (S422B230050)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. 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. (10 points)

(ii) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priority or priorities established for the competition. (10 points)

Strengths:

Strengths: The activities listed build on what the P.I. Gibson and P.I. Smith and related faculty have been working on in Milwaukee for several years. The faculty team from Marquette University is well-accomplished and the partners, especially Milwaukee Public Schools, express support for the project. The "Milwaukee Roots" proposal is innovative in putting students behind the camera as they interview their families and neighbors about local history (Page E14). The "Milwaukee Roots" proposal shows a clear rationale for place-based learning as a way to engage students in Milwaukee Public Schools about history and civics.

There is a clearly demonstrated need to support the student population in history and civics, as the proposal cites low test scores by MPS students on state assessment tests. The logic model (Page E66) explains inputs and expected outcomes in the short, medium, and long term.

The proposal promises exceptionally innovative approaches in seeking to engage an underserved student population in local history as a way to interest the same students in wider history education. This is a potentially powerful activity to engage students in doing history. The proposal is convincing in maintaining that students who are engaged in active learning of local history will become more interested in history in general and more interested in civic participation as they grow older and become citizens.

Weaknesses:

:"Milwaukee Roots" aims to serve teachers in K-12. It is unclear in the proposal if the summer institutes for teachers and the Community of Practice workshops will group teachers in K-5, middle school, and high school separately or all together (Page E38). The concern is that teachers in Wisconsin teach history and civics differently at the elementary, middle, and high school levels, and it is not clear that the same teacher training and student activities will work well at the different levels.

Reader's Score: 17

Selection Criteria - Need for Project

1. 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. (8 points)**
- 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. (7 points)**
- iii. **The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project are focused on those with greatest needs. (10 points)**

Strengths:

MPS is the biggest school district in the State of Wisconsin with almost 70,000 students. Eighty percent of the student body is either Black or Latinx. A comparable percentage of students are economically disadvantaged. A fifth of the students report learning disabilities and one-seventh of the students are ESLs. MPS has struggled for decades to close the equity gap among its student body (Pages E10, E53).

The proposal is convincing about the problems that MPS students experience. The State of Wisconsin's Department of Public Instruction identified MPS as "meeting few expectations." (Page E34) The proposal also identifies low scores by Wisconsin students, not just MPS students, on NAEP's civics exam. (Page E34).

The proposal identifies one problem in low student achievement because of a disconnect in the lives of students and the subject matter studied. The proposal also identifies a problem with the preparation of teachers who may be unfamiliar with Milwaukee's history and culture (Page E38).

The proposal states that one explanation for low student scores on the Wisconsin civics test is that the knowledge tested is remote from the lives of the students. "Milwaukee Roots" expects that students will become excited and motivated by active learning in their neighborhoods and across the city and that this will extend to better attendance and overall performance.

The proposal considers the entire student body of MPS, 70,000 students in all, as having the greatest needs. Indeed, the proposal states that students in suburban districts not part of MPS, but located in Milwaukee County, may be considered disadvantaged (Page E40).

Weaknesses:

The proposal acknowledges that student test scores on Wisconsin's civics exam may not show a statistically significant improvement despite taking part in "Milwaukee Roots," mainly because the state test does not cover local history and geography (Page E44). There is something of a mismatch between identifying the problems MPS students face and the solution of "Milwaukee Roots."

The proposal frequently refers to serving all 70,000 students, but the Summer Workshops will only provide professional development for 25 teachers, so only a fraction of the students in MPS will have instructors who participated in the Summer Workshops. The proposal is aspirational in saying that the Community of Practice "will potentially reach 100+ teachers/10,000 students by 2026." (Page E10).

Reader's Score: 21

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. **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. (13 points)**
- ii. **The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project. (12 points)**

Strengths:

The management plan is well-conceived and has regular check-in milestones and timelines (Pages E322-E325)

The P.I.s associated with “Milwaukee Roots” are very well qualified, based on their past research and community engagement, especially with MPS.

The assessment plan includes collection of data on individual student achievement, before and after involvement with “Milwaukee Roots.” The P.I.’s also propose doing individual case studies of successful teachers and their classrooms. The proposal has a strong component of continuous evaluation and improvement based on making use of Marquette’s faculty with expertise in quantitative measurements and qualitative evaluations (Page E44). It is a strength of the proposal that there will be pre- and post-project assessments of student performance, including test scores, attendance, and completion of assignments. (Page E45)

Weaknesses:

One concern about the management plan is that the project is heavily dependent on the Marquette faculty and on the as-yet-to-be-hired project director, described in the proposal as “a key member of the Project Management Team.” (Page E42)

There is a substantial gap between what the faculty earn as scholar-teachers (all make more than \$100,000/year on 9-month contracts) and the \$50,000 salary that the project director is budgeted to earn (Page E332). It is concerning that the project director will be lowly paid and at something of a status disadvantage to the faculty.

It is also a concern, mentioned above in the Quality of Project part that one of the P.I.’s also oversees a \$750,000 grant for two of the three years of the proposed “Milwaukee Roots” project.

“Milwaukee Roots” also promises a web-based “pedagogical ecosystem” of resources, developed by Marquette faculty, however, that the pedagogical ecosystem is “still in development and emerging.” (Page E23) It is not clear from the proposal if the pedagogical ecosystem will be available from Day 1 of the project or at the end of the project. In this reviewer’s experience with web-based history projects, the design and implantation of websites, especially those with a geographical basis for doing history, are difficult and require a great deal of work. It is a concern about the working of the project that the pedagogical ecosystem may not be available until near the end of the project. (Page E322)

Reader's Score: 21

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

1. **The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources for the proposed project. In determining the quality of the adequacy of resources, the Secretary considers the following factors:**
 - i. **The adequacy of support, including facilities, equipment, supplies, and other resources, from the applicant organization or the lead applicant organization. (6 points)**
 - ii. **The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project. (8 points)**
 - iii. **The extent to which the applicant demonstrates that it has the resources to operate the**

project beyond the length of the grant, including a multiyear financial and operating model and accompanying plan; the demonstrated commitment of any partners; evidence of broad support from stakeholders (e.g., SEAs, LEAs, teachers' unions) critical to the project's long-term success; or more than one of these types of evidence. (8 points)

iv. The relevance and demonstrated commitment of each partner in the proposed project to the implementation and success of the project. (8 points)

Strengths:

Marquette has expressed institutional support for CURTO in general and to “Milwaukee Roots” in particular (Page E299). There are letters of support from MPS, from Vel Phillips School (part of Wauwatosa Public Schools), from St. Joan’s High School, and from America’s Black Holocaust Museum. There are also letters of commitment from the Marquette faculty involved in the project. CURTO has the experience and resources to guide this project for the three year period. MPS is the most important partner on the project and the letter of support from Dr. Posley, the district superintendent is significant (Pages E300-301).

Weaknesses:

The great bulk of the dollars in the proposal go to Marquette University in the form of faculty pay, graduate assistantships, and project manager’s salary. As much as 90 percent of the funds requested go to Marquette University. Comparatively few dollars, just \$120,000, goes to teacher stipends for attending the summer institutes and the school-year Community of Practice workshops over three years. The proposal is vague about how teachers will be recruited for the summer workshops and the Community of Practice. Dr. Posley’s letter of support (Pages E300-301) does not address how MPS will work as a partner in recruiting its own teachers to participate.

Marquette is in a position to offer teachers graduate credit or continuing education credit for teacher licensure, but for unexplained reasons, “Milwaukee Roots” is not doing so. In this reviewer’s experience working with Milwaukee Public Schools teachers on past TAH-funded and other projects, those at the start of their education careers prefer receiving graduate credit rather than a paid stipend for their work. The reason is that teachers at the beginning of their careers wish to work on obtaining a masters degree so they may move up the pay scale. Veteran teachers who hold masters degrees, especially those in MPS who have a masters plus 24 additional graduate credits, prefer cash stipends because they cannot go any higher in the scale. This proposal would be stronger if Marquette offered teachers a choice: stipends or graduate credit.

Reader's Score: 24

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority 1 - Innovative Activities for Civic Engagement

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

Under this priority, we provide funding to promote new and existing evidence-based strategies to encourage innovative civics and government learning strategies and professional development activities and programs for teachers, principals, or other school leaders, particularly such instruction, strategies, activities, and programs that benefit low income students and underserved populations. To meet this priority, a project must 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.

Strengths:

Students working on oral history videos, micro-documentaries, and digital markers is very much “hands-on.” (Page E16)

Weaknesses:

None identified

Reader's Score: 5

Competitive Preference Priority 2 - Student Access to Resources and Opportunities

1. Competitive Preference Priority 2: Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities (up to 7 points)

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

a) in one or more of the following educational settings: (1) Early learning programs (2) Elementary school (3) Middle school (4) High school (5) Career and technical education programs (6) Out-of-schooltime settings (7) Alternative schools and programs (8) Juvenile justice system or correctional facilities

b) That examines the sources of inequity and inadequacy and implement responses, and that may include one or both of the following:

c) Rigorous, engaging, and well-rounded (e.g., that include music and the arts) approaches to learning that are inclusive with regard to race, ethnicity, culture, language, and disability status and prepare students for college, career, and civic life, including civics programs that support students in understanding and engaging in American democratic practices (up to 3 points).

d) Establishing, expanding, or improving the engagement of underserved community members (including underserved students and families) in informing and making decisions that influence policy and practice at the school, district, or State level by elevating their voices, through their participation and their perspectives and providing them with access to opportunities for leadership (e.g., establishing partnerships between civic student government programs and parent and caregiver leadership initiatives) (up to 4 points).

Strengths:

The place-based learning activities highlighted in “Milwaukee Roots” is an approach to learning that is inclusive. The activities planned for students give every indication that students will have access to educational opportunities. The proposal cites published literature that “youth participatory action” projects work (Page E14)

The strong participation of faculty from Vel Phillips School insures that students who are in the juvenile justice system will have their voices heard. This is unusual and highly commendable (Page E19).

Weaknesses:

none identified

Reader's Score: 7

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/04/2023 10:37 AM