

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/12/2024 10:52 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Center for Civic Education (S411C240370)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	20	20
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	29
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Project Personnel	10	10
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	10	10
Sub Total	70	69
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. Promoting Equity	3	3
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
1. Impact of COVID-19	3	3
Sub Total	6	6
Total	76	75

Technical Review Form

Panel #15 - Early Tier 1 - 15: 84.411C

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Center for Civic Education (S411C240370)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

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

Reader's Score: 20

Sub

1. (1) The extent to which the proposed project involves the development or demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies. (20 points)

Strengths:

The Center for Civic Education (CCE) proposes a project that promises new strategies that build on existing strategies. Evidence based research paired with robust data related to the proposed work has been cited (p. e12 and p. e20). For instance, the Integrated Civic SEL project integrates civics content and methods with social-emotional learning (SEL) competencies to promote engaged citizenship, are crucial in addressing today's complex civic and societal challenges, particularly those that disproportionately affect underserved students (p. e12 – p.e20). This is significant to CCE's grant application because it highlights the program's potential to make a meaningful impact on a vulnerable population. By emphasizing the role of Civic SEL in empowering underserved students to navigate and address pressing civic issues, the application underscores the relevance and urgency of funding this initiative. This connection between the program's objectives and the needs of underserved communities strengthens the case for support, demonstrating the grant's potential to drive positive, systemic change. The Integrated Civic SEL project is compelling, important and highly ambitious. If successful, such understanding of civics knowledge, skills, and dispositions would further allow the Integrated Civics SEL project to be successfully accomplished, which would have a high impact on the field of civic education (p. e8 and p. e12 – p. e20).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 20

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:

Reader's Score: 29

Sub

- 1. (1) The extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework. (10 points)**

Strengths:

The Integrated Civic Social Emotional Learning (ICSEL) Logic Model is a significant strength of the project because it serves as the conceptual framework for the Center for Civic Education (CCE) (p. e137). By providing a structured roadmap, the ICSEL Logic Model ensures that all project activities are aligned with the goals of the teacher's professional development, as well as the curriculum and instructional materials. This alignment creates a cohesive approach, where every component of the project supports and reinforces the others. Although national SEL organizations advocate for integrating social-emotional learning into academic instruction, based on the research presented by the CCE, none of the forty established SEL frameworks identified in other organizations' comprehensive inventory of high-quality programs were specifically designed for the civics domain (p. e12 and p. e114 – p.e118). As a guiding framework, the model facilitates a systematic and focused implementation, enhancing the overall effectiveness of the project by ensuring consistency and coherence throughout its implementation (p. e20 – p. e21 and p. e114 – p. e118).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

- 2. (2) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable. (5 points)**

Strengths:

The Center for Civic Education (CCE) well outlines the goals and objectives of the Integrated Civic Social Emotional Learning (ICSEL) project. For instance, the ICSEL's main goal is to develop and pilot new professional development (PD) programs and materials, deliver professional development and mentorship to teachers to show improved instructional efficacy, and to engage students in collaborative project-based learning that address policy issues, civics knowledge, skills, and dispositions (p. e21 and p. e22). The CCE also provides a description of the programmatic goals (p. e112 – p. e113). Overall, the goals and objectives the CCE have in place include measurable outcomes that can easily assess the project's progress for its participating teachers and students (p. e21 and p.e22).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

- 3. (3) 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. (15 points)**

Strengths:

The target population for this project are 8,850 high need students in grades 6 – 12 and their civics teachers (p. e8). The student population is a diverse group of students of color, students from low-income backgrounds, English language learners, and others who lack academic resources that promote successful graduation (p. e8).The teacher population represent middle school and high school teachers of civic education (p. e8 and p. e36). In year one, the program will be piloted with 30 teachers and the students in their classrooms (p. e25 and p. e36). The pilot group is comprised of teachers and students from one of the civic education state partner organizations in various states (p. e8 and p. e36). The applicant anticipates serving 750 students (p. e25 and p. e36). Following the pilot

Sub

year, 180 more teachers and 8100 more students will be invited to participate in the program (p. e25 and p.e36).

Weaknesses:

More information is needed to explain the criteria used to determine participation in the project. For example, it is not clearly stated if all students in grades 6 – 12 civic classes are required to participate in the program or if the program is optional for those students (p. e8 and p. e36).

Reader's Score: 14

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the personnel who will carry out the proposed project. In determining the quality of project personnel, the Secretary considers the following factor:

Reader's Score: 10

Sub

1. (1) The extent to which the applicant encourages applications for employment from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability. In addition, the Secretary considers the qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel. (10 points)

Strengths:

The Center for Civic Education's (CCE) is an Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action Employer (p. e30). The organization actively seeks applicants from underrepresented groups and does not discriminate based upon race, religion, color, national origin, gender, sexual orientation, sexual expression, age, status as an individual with a disability, or any other legally protected characteristics (p. e30). The CCE has a diverse team in place that is well-equipped to manage the project efficiently. Collectively, the team has over 50 years of experience (p.e30). Additionally, the resumes of key staff demonstrate that staff have diverse experiences in civic learning and public education, grant management, informational technology, publishing, community, strategic partnerships, and grant management (p. e30 and p. e44 – p. e75).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

Reader's Score: 10

Sub

- 1. (1) 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.**

Strengths:

The Center for Civic Education (CCE) provides a management plan that is comprehensive in nature and clearly articulates how the Integrated Civics SEL (ICS) project will be implemented (p. e31 – p. e34). A key strength of the project management plan lies in the expertise and coordinated capabilities of the CCE’s grant management team (p. e31 and p. e34). This team will collaborate closely with an education research lab to oversee the contracted experts, and ensure seamless project management (p. e31 – p. e34). The grant management team is also responsible for launching the project, training coordinators and mentors, providing technical assistance to state-level implementation teams, and monitoring progress (p. e31 – p. e34). The team will also utilize formative evaluation data to maintain project alignment and effectiveness, while leading the national network in strategic planning for dissemination. This comprehensive approach ensures the project is managed with precision and focus, and that all milestones can be met on time. A plan is provided that highlights specifications for the professional development for the summer institute and sessions that will occur during the academic school year. The plan provides intricate details including the name of each session, the number of hours participants earn, and a description of sessions identified throughout the application (p. e104 and p. e105).

A further strength of the application is the budget narrative and justification. This applicant's budget outlined the allocation of resources for a three-year period and provided a detailed breakdown of the budget, which included personnel with clearly defined responsibilities, network systems, program support, training, curriculum, travel, school level support, and coaching (p. e150 – p. e171). The budget also includes justification from two of its partnering organizations (p. e171- p. e174).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1

- 1. Competitive Preference Priority 1:**

Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities: Implementers and Partners (up to 3 points)

Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate how the project will be implemented by or in partnership with one or more of the following entities:

- (a) Community colleges (as defined in the NIA)**
- (b) Historically Black colleges and universities (as defined in the NIA)**
- (c) Tribal Colleges and Universities (as defined in the NIA)**
- (d) Minority-serving institutions (as defined in the NIA)**

Strengths:

The Center for Civic Education (CCE) partners with non-profit civic education organizations, a civics education research lab housed at a partnering university, community colleges, and minority-serving institutions in six sites that support the Integrated Civics SEL Project (p. e8). Letters of support were providing by each partnering organization demonstrating

their commitment to the success of the project (p. e76 – p. e102). These colleges and universities will offer input on ICS professional development, contribute expert speakers, host project events for teachers and students, participate in public hearings by engaging with students, and provide feedback on students' project portfolios (p. e31). Clearly, this project meets Competitive Preference Priority 1 - Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities: Implementers and Partners (p. e13).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 3

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 2

1. Competitive Preference Priority 2:

Addressing the Impact of COVID-19 on Students, Educators, and Faculty: Community Asset-Mapping and Needs Assessment and Evidence-Based Instructional Approaches and Supports (up to 3 points).

Projects that are designed to address the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic, including impacts that extend beyond the duration of the pandemic itself, on the students most impacted by the pandemic, with a focus on underserved students and the educators who serve them through the following priority areas:

(a) Conducting community asset-mapping and needs assessments that may include an assessment of the extent to which students, including subgroups of students, have become disengaged from learning, including students not participating in in-person or remote instruction, and specific strategies for reengaging and supporting students and their families; and

(b) Using evidence-based instructional approaches and supports, such as professional development, coaching, ongoing support for educators, high-quality tutoring, expanded access to rigorous coursework and content across K-12, and expanded learning time to accelerate learning for students in ways that ensure all students have the opportunity to successfully meet challenging academic content standards without contributing to tracking or remedial courses.

Strengths:

A key strength of the Center for Civic Education's (CCE) proposal is that because of the the COVID -19 pandemic, the Center for Civic Education's (CCE) project focuses on re-engaging students and fostering family involvement (p. e26 – p. e29). Educators will identify and integrate strategies to re-engage students and strengthen family participation into their instructional plans. By designing targeted approaches, teachers will ensure successful student engagement and provide opportunities for students to meet challenging civics content standards ((p. e26 – p. e29). Additionally, teachers will implement the new Integrated Civic Social (ICS) lesson plans during at least 20 hours of Project Citizen instruction (p. e26). This comprehensive approach includes all steps of the Project Citizen process, where students collaborate in groups to research and develop a public policy solution and presentation addressing a community-level problem they have identified. Additionally, the approach not only re-engages students but also enhances their learning experiences and civic understanding, effectively addressing the challenges brought on by the COVID-19 pandemic (p. e26 – p. e29). A final strength of the application is that prior to implementing the project, teachers will conduct asset mapping and needs assessments to identify students who have become disengaged from learning, in alignment with Competitive Preference Priority 2 (p. e26 – p. e29).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 3

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/12/2024 10:52 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/10/2024 12:01 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Center for Civic Education (S411C240370)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	20	20
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	28
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Project Personnel	10	10
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	10	8
Sub Total	70	66
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. Promoting Equity	3	3
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
1. Impact of COVID-19	3	3
Sub Total	6	6
Total	76	72

Technical Review Form

Panel #15 - Early Tier 1 - 15: 84.411C

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Center for Civic Education (S411C240370)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

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

Reader's Score: 20

Sub

1. (1) The extent to which the proposed project involves the development or demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies. (20 points)

Strengths:

The proposed project involves developing promising new strategies that build on existing strategies. The project leverages the Civic SEL Framework to integrate social-emotional learning (SEL) with civic education, addressing a significant gap in current educational practices (e11). The project builds on the Project Citizen curriculum, which has demonstrated effectiveness through rigorous research, including randomized controlled trials (Page e16). The project also employs an iterative research and development process, involving expert teachers and continuous feedback to refine materials and strategies (e17).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 20

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:

Reader's Score: 28

Sub

1. (1) The extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework. (10 points)

Sub

Strengths:

The conceptual framework for the proposed research in the Integrated Civic SEL project is well-defined and robust. The project includes a detailed logic model (Appendix G, e20) that aligns program components, mediators, and outcomes with project goals. The evaluation plan (e33) outlines methods to assess the impact on both teachers and students, ensuring a thorough analysis of outcomes. The project builds on established research in civic and social-emotional learning (e11), providing a solid foundation for the proposed activities.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

2. (2) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable. (5 points)

Strengths:

The goals, objectives, and outcomes are clearly outlined in the project narrative (e20-e22). For example, Goal 1 aims to innovate Project Citizen curricular and educator support materials using the Civic SEL Framework (e21). The outcomes are quantifiable, such as a 10% increase in teachers' knowledge of Civic SEL competencies (e21). Each goal is supported by specific activities and expected results, ensuring clarity and focus (e20-e22).

Weaknesses:

Some objectives, like supporting high-quality educator PD, need more specific metrics (e21). It is unclear how the long-term impact on students' civic engagement will be assessed (e22).

Reader's Score: 4

3. (3) 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. (15 points)

Strengths:

The project uses the Civic SEL Framework to integrate social-emotional learning (SEL) with civic education, addressing both the academic and social needs of underserved students (e11). By integrating SEL with civic education, students are more engaged in their learning. For example, when students participate in community projects, they apply academic skills in real-world contexts, which enhances their understanding and retention of the material (e45). Civic education often involves discussions about societal issues, which encourages students to think critically and develop problem-solving skills. This is particularly beneficial for underserved students who may not have as many opportunities to develop these skills outside of school (e52).

Weaknesses:

More information is needed to determine the criteria for student participation (e26, e177).

Reader's Score: 14

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the personnel who will carry out the proposed project. In determining the quality of project personnel, the Secretary considers the following factor:

Reader's Score: 10

Sub

- 1. (1) The extent to which the applicant encourages applications for employment from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability. In addition, the Secretary considers the qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel. (10 points)**

Strengths:

The applicant demonstrates a strong commitment to encouraging applications from underrepresented groups, including those based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability (e3). The project personnel have relevant training and experience, as evidenced by the resumes and qualifications provided in Appendix B (e44). For instance, the project lead, holds a Ph.D. in Education with a focus on social-emotional learning and has over 15 years of experience in developing and implementing SEL programs in underserved communities (Appendix B, e44).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

- 1. The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the adequacy of resources and quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

Reader's Score: 8

Sub

- 1. (1) 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.**

Strengths:

The management plan outlines specific roles for state coordinators, mentor teachers, and the Center's staff, ensuring accountability and clarity in task execution (e18). The plan includes extensive training for state coordinators and mentor teachers, followed by continuous support and professional learning communities (PLCs) to sustain implementation (e18). The plan emphasizes an iterative approach, incorporating feedback from teachers and students to refine materials and strategies (e17).

Weaknesses:

The plan requires significant resources and coordination, which could be challenging to manage within the proposed budget (e19). The management plan may be inadequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project. For example, the capacity of state coordinators to meet the project goals along with their full-time job responsibilities is unclear (e31, e39).

Sub

Reader's Score: 8

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1

1. Competitive Preference Priority 1:

Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities: Implementers and Partners (up to 3 points)

Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate how the project will be implemented by or in partnership with one or more of the following entities:

- (a) Community colleges (as defined in the NIA)
- (b) Historically Black colleges and universities (as defined in the NIA)
- (c) Tribal Colleges and Universities (as defined in the NIA)
- (d) Minority-serving institutions (as defined in the NIA)

Strengths:

The project described meets the priority by partnering with several entities, including Community Colleges, Minority-Serving Institutions, and Non-Profit Civic Education Organizations. These partnerships help ensure the project addresses the needs of underserved students and communities.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 3

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 2

1. Competitive Preference Priority 2:

Addressing the Impact of COVID-19 on Students, Educators, and Faculty: Community Asset-Mapping and Needs Assessment and Evidence-Based Instructional Approaches and Supports (up to 3 points).

Projects that are designed to address the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic, including impacts that extend beyond the duration of the pandemic itself, on the students most impacted by the pandemic, with a focus on underserved students and the educators who serve them through the following priority areas:

- (a) Conducting community asset-mapping and needs assessments that may include an assessment of the extent to which students, including subgroups of students, have become disengaged from learning, including students not participating in in-person or remote instruction, and specific strategies for reengaging and supporting students and their families; and
- (b) Using evidence-based instructional approaches and supports, such as professional development, coaching, ongoing support for educators, high-quality tutoring, expanded access to rigorous coursework and content across K-12, and expanded learning time to accelerate learning for students in ways that ensure all students have the opportunity to successfully meet challenging academic content standards without contributing to tracking or remedial courses.

Strengths:

The project targets underserved students who were disproportionately affected by the pandemic, addressing their specific needs (e23). Ongoing professional development (PD) and mentorship for teachers help them design and implement strategies to re-engage students (e26). Teachers conduct asset mapping to identify and support disengaged students, ensuring tailored interventions (Page e26).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: **3**

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/10/2024 12:01 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/16/2024 01:23 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Center for Civic Education (S411C240370)

Reader #4: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	20	20
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	28
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Project Personnel	10	10
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	10	8
Sub Total	70	66
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. Promoting Equity	3	3
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
1. Impact of COVID-19	3	3
Sub Total	6	6
Total	76	72

Technical Review Form

Panel #15 - Early Tier 1 - 15: 84.411C

Reader #4: *****

Applicant: Center for Civic Education (S411C240370)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

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

Reader's Score: 20

Sub

1. (1) The extent to which the proposed project involves the development or demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies. (20 points)

Strengths:

The Center for Civic Education (CCE) proposes a project that incorporates promising new strategies that build on existing strategies. CCE proposes to develop and pilot new professional development and curricular materials to increase students' and educators' civics knowledge and Social-Emotional Learning (SEL) competencies (e8). By leveraging both nationally recognized SEL frameworks (e16) and evidence-based civics curriculum (e15-16), the applicant proposes a justified and innovative new strategy that builds on existing strategies and meets a timely need for students and educators in education (e15—16). The applicant cites relevant research and provides data related to the proposed project (e12, e20) that demonstrates how the project will meet a timely need for students and educators.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 20

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:

Reader's Score: 28

Sub

1. (1) The extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework. (10 points)

Sub

Strengths:

The conceptual framework underlying the proposed activities draws on significant research around nationally recognized core SEL competencies and research on acquisition of civic skills (e20-21). The core activities and curriculum are further described as working in alignment with project-based learning (PBL) elements (e116). The entire model is integrated into existing curriculum and activities (e121-128) that have been demonstrated to be effective to an evidentiary level aligned with the standards of What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) (e20, e30). Additionally, the importance of aligning instructional strategies with SEL strategies that with whole-child support promote equity have strong evidence for supporting empowerment (e13, e16) and student civic engagement (e13-15).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

2. (2) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable. (5 points)

Strengths:

The proposal has three primary goals related to the development and integration of existing SEL and civics education resources (e21-22). Each of the proposed goals have related objectives and specified, measurable outcomes (e21-22). These goals, objectives, and outcomes align with the logic model (e137), and the proposal details project milestones, responsible teams, and timelines for when various activities related to objectives are to be accomplished (e32-34).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

3. (3) 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. (15 points)

Strengths:

The proposal documents a significant level of knowledge around the population-level needs of the target population, including a thorough understanding of key factors that may limit high-quality civic education in American classrooms (e20, e23). The project is specifically designed to meet the unique needs of high needs students, defined as students of color, students from low-income backgrounds, English learners, and others who lack academic resources that promote successful graduation (e8). The applicant details an iterative process to support the targeted populations of both students and teachers through a series of key activities that will enable the applicant to be responsive to evolving teacher and student needs (e24-26).

Weaknesses:

The proposal's plan to survey 10,000 middle and high school teachers in the first three months of the grant (e24) and incorporate the results of that survey into a meaningful report by March of 2025 (e32) seems unrealistic. The extent to which the design of the project is appropriate to meaningfully address the needs of the target population with this survey as a foundational piece of the project indicates a potentially inadequate design. More information is needed to describe how educators will be provided with ongoing support to maintain consistency in their integration of SEL and civics curriculum. Additionally, more information is needed on how participants will be selected to participate in the project. For example, it is not clearly described if all students will be required to participate or if

Sub

participation will be optional.

Reader's Score: 13

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel

1. **The Secretary considers the quality of the personnel who will carry out the proposed project. In determining the quality of project personnel, the Secretary considers the following factor:**

Reader's Score: 10

Sub

1. **(1) The extent to which the applicant encourages applications for employment from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability. In addition, the Secretary considers the qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel. (10 points)**

Strengths:

Key project personnel appear to be well qualified to complete their indicated tasks, with significant training, experience, knowledge, and skills necessary to meet the project's objectives (e29-30, e44-75). Project leads including those who will facilitate both research and implementation have extensive experience facilitating previous Education Innovation and Research grants (e29) and over 50 years, as an organization, facilitating and implementing effective civics curriculum (e29-30). The proposal documents how the applicant encourages applications for employment from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented (e30).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

Reader's Score: 8

Sub

1. **(1) 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.**

Sub

Strengths:

The applicant provides a detailed overview of the management plan for the project, including identification of responsible parties and activities of those team members (e31-34). The proposal includes a project timeline with explicit milestones and responsible parties identified (e32-34). The management plan's timeline and activities align with project goals and objectives (e21-22) and the project's logic model (e137).

Weaknesses:

More information is needed to clearly show how the proposed project will achieve the objectives on time and within budget. For example, the proposed project requires significant engagement and many hours of work from classroom teachers, including travel to professional learning communities during the summer (e17, e26, e33) and professional development throughout the school year (e19, e33). Additionally, the proposal provides limited evidence of how teachers will be supported or encouraged to participate. More information is needed to describe how teachers will be supported, such as through incentives (e39) for the level of effort required to implement program components (e150-174). It is unclear how the project will document in-kind teacher participation and how this will impact classroom educators (e175). Additionally, reliance on state coordinators may lead to difficulty sustaining the program due to their status as employees of other nonprofits and roles as educational administrators (e31). More information is needed on how the role of state coordinator integrates into and relates to their other employment.

Reader's Score: 8

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1

1. Competitive Preference Priority 1:

Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities: Implementers and Partners (up to 3 points)

Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate how the project will be implemented by or in partnership with one or more of the following entities:

- (a) Community colleges (as defined in the NIA)**
- (b) Historically Black colleges and universities (as defined in the NIA)**
- (c) Tribal Colleges and Universities (as defined in the NIA)**
- (d) Minority-serving institutions (as defined in the NIA)**

Strengths:

The proposal details how the applicant will partner with community colleges and minority-serving institutions (e8, e31, e77-102). The applicant partners with community colleges, Historically Black colleges and Universities, Tribal Colleges and Universities, and minority-serving institutions through their extensive partnership network (e77-102). These institutions will provide input on professional development, contribute expert speakers, host events, and engage with students (e31).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 3

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 2

1. Competitive Preference Priority 2:

Addressing the Impact of COVID-19 on Students, Educators, and Faculty: Community Asset-Mapping and Needs Assessment and Evidence-Based Instructional Approaches and Supports (up to 3 points).

Projects that are designed to address the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic, including impacts that extend beyond the duration of the pandemic itself, on the students most impacted by the pandemic, with a focus on underserved students and the educators who serve them through the following priority areas:

(a) Conducting community asset-mapping and needs assessments that may include an assessment of the extent to which students, including subgroups of students, have become disengaged from learning, including students not participating in in-person or remote instruction, and specific strategies for reengaging and supporting students and their families; and

(b) Using evidence-based instructional approaches and supports, such as professional development, coaching, ongoing support for educators, high-quality tutoring, expanded access to rigorous coursework and content across K-12, and expanded learning time to accelerate learning for students in ways that ensure all students have the opportunity to successfully meet challenging academic content standards without contributing to tracking or remedial courses.

Strengths:

The proposal discusses the significant and disproportionate impact the COVID-19 pandemic has had on learners and educators, particularly underserved students whose learning and achievement gaps were exacerbated during the pandemic (e12, e14-15, e18, e27). For example, the applicant notes current curricular requirements and classroom practices do not sufficiently support underserved students, whose learning and achievement gaps were exacerbated during the COVID-19 pandemic (e14). Additionally, the proposal specifically addresses student needs-assessment (e13) and asset-mapping to identify students who have become disengaged from learning (e26, e104).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 3

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 09/16/2024 01:23 PM

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 10/03/2024 02:02 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Center for Civic Education (S411C240370)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	30	27
Sub Total	30	27
Total	30	27

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - Early Tier 2 - 3: 84.411C

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Center for Civic Education (S411C240370)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. 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:

Reader's Score: 27

Sub

1. (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse standards with or without reservations as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbook (as defined in this notice). (20 points)

Strengths:

The applicant's evaluation, conducted by an external independent evaluator with expertise with evaluating education programs, if well implemented, will meet What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) without reservations (e34). The study design, which will be a quasi-experimental design the first year which will serve as a pilot year, will employ a combination of quantitative and qualitative methods to measure outcomes and provide evidence of the project's effectiveness (e35). The core quantitative research studies will be conducted in the second and third years and are designed to meet WWC evidence standards without reservations. Multisite, school-level RCTs will be conducted for teachers and students (e37).

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not elaborate how they will address attrition should it occur. They also do not specify the amount of the monetary incentive they plan to provide to study participants in order to engage them in the process.

Reader's Score: 17

2. (2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes. (5 points)

Strengths:

The project evaluators will work in partnership to solve problems and maintain regular, cooperative, systematic feedback and program assessment, a process that has been proven to be successful in recent studies conducted (e40). The development process incorporates regular feedback from participants and data to improve teacher and student outcomes in a variety of settings (e40).

Sub

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 5

3. (3) The extent to which the evaluation plan clearly articulates the key project components, mediators, and outcomes, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation. (5 points)

Strengths:

The evaluation plan clearly articulates the key project components, mediators, and outcomes, including a focus on collecting both qualitative and quantitative data throughout the process (e40). The study findings will be regularly conveyed to the project staff, coordinators, and teachers (e40). In the instances where the measurable thresholds for acceptable implementation are not met and could potentially compromise the research will be discussed and steps will be taken to remediate the issues. (e40).

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 10/03/2024 02:02 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 10/07/2024 04:35 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Center for Civic Education (S411C240370)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	30	27
Sub Total	30	27
Total	30	27

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - Early Tier 2 - 3: 84.411C

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Center for Civic Education (S411C240370)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. 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:

Reader's Score: 27

Sub

1. (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse standards with or without reservations as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbook (as defined in this notice). (20 points)

Strengths:

The evaluation plan is thoughtfully designed to provide evidence of the Integrated Civic SEL (ICS) program's effectiveness, addressing key educational outcomes while adhering to rigorous research standards and What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) with reservations. The use of a randomized control trial of Robust Randomized Control Trial (RCTs) design for both teacher and student studies significantly enhances the credibility of the findings (e38). By randomly assigning schools to either the intervention or control group, the study minimizes selection bias and allows for a clearer attribution of any observed effects to the ICS program (e38). The evaluation employs a combination of quantitative and qualitative methods, including pretest/posttest surveys, ethnographies, and semi-structured interviews (e36). This multilayered approach ensures a robust assessment of both teacher and student outcomes, measuring not just knowledge and skills but also engagement and pedagogical practices. Such thorough measurement will provide an understanding of the program's impact. Conducting a pilot study (e36) in the first year allows for preliminary insights into the effectiveness of the Professional Development program and the curriculum. This early assessment can inform adjustments before the full-scale RCT is conducted, ensuring that the evaluation design is refined based on real-world feedback. The pilot will also help establish baseline measures and identify best practices, contributing to a more effective implementation in subsequent years (e36).

Weaknesses:

While measures are in place to monitor attrition, the plan does not detail specific strategies to mitigate differential attrition between intervention and control groups (e39).

Reader's Score: 18

2. (2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes. (5 points)

Strengths:

The evaluation will incorporate Design-Based Implementation Research (DBIR) (e38), facilitating regular feedback loops between program developers, educators, and researchers. This iterative process aims to address challenges

Sub

and enhance implementation, ultimately aiming for improved outcomes for both teachers and students. A pilot study (e36) in the first year will involve 30 teachers and their students, using a quasi-experimental design. Pretests and posttests will assess the effectiveness of the Professional Development (PD) and curriculum, while interviews will offer qualitative insights (e36). Feedback from this phase will inform necessary adjustments before the full-scale randomized control trial (RCT) begins in subsequent years. Fidelity of implementation will be rigorously assessed using quantitative metrics (e.g., PD hours completed) and qualitative data from observations and interviews. Regular communication of findings will allow for timely remediation of any issues that may arise, ensuring that the evaluation remains aligned with its objectives.

Weaknesses:

The teachers self-report improvements in their knowledge and practices without external validation, could lead to skewed findings (e37). For example, a teacher might claim they have integrated Civic SEL into their classes effectively, but without classroom observations, this claim remains unverified.

Reader's Score: 4

3. (3) The extent to which the evaluation plan clearly articulates the key project components, mediators, and outcomes, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation. (5 points)

Strengths:

The project includes a logic model that connects teacher PD to expected increases in teacher knowledge and improvements in teaching practices (e34). This framework clarifies how these changes are expected to affect student outcomes, such as civic knowledge and skills.

The evaluation plan specifies that the effectiveness of the ICS program will be measured through pretests and posttests for both teachers and students. For example, it includes measurable thresholds for what constitutes an acceptable improvement in Civic SEL knowledge among teachers, making it easier to assess the program's impact quantitatively (e40).

The use of DBIR in the implementation study allows for systematic feedback from participants. Regular communication and assessment will ensure that any issues related to implementation fidelity are addressed promptly. For instance, if certain PD components are not being delivered as intended, the plan includes mechanisms to identify these gaps and adjust the program accordingly to maintain high standards of implementation (e25; e40).

Weaknesses:

No weakness noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 10/07/2024 04:35 PM