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

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Center for Civic Education (S411B210038)
Reader #1: **********

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	15	13
Sub Total	15	13
Strategy to Scale		
Strategy to Scale		
1. Strategy to Scale	20	17
Sub Total	20	17
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	20	16
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Quality of the Management	20	18
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	25	
Sub Total	65	34
Priority Questions		
CPP1		
Computer Science		
1. Computer Science	5	
Sub Total	5	
Total	105	64

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - EIR Mid-Phase - 3: 84.411B

Reader #1: **********

Applicant: Center for Civic Education (S411B210038)

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 factors:

Reader's Score: 13

Sub

1. **(1) The national significance of the proposed project.**

   Strengths:

   Targeting disadvantaged, at-risk youth that face a "civic empowerment gap" with a curriculum that has proven to raise students' scores substantially is of great national significance. The applicant makes a point to serve English learners, students of color, and students with disabilities The applicant points out that political influence is concentrated among more privileged groups. The proposal provides a professional development program to instruct the targeted population with a civic curriculum, We the People: The Citizen and the Constitution which could greatly impact an entire generation with the empowerment to advocate for themselves. (e20)

   Weaknesses:

   Reader's Score:

2. **(2) The potential contribution of the proposed project to increased knowledge or understanding of educational problems, issues, or effective strategies.**

   Strengths:

   The applicant makes a strong argument to focus on the quality of the professional development to include instructional practices that serve English learners, students of color and students with disabilities. Supporting the classroom teacher with the development of the digital materials to be used not only for PD but also for classroom instruction is an effective strategy. (e21)

   Weaknesses:

   More information is needed to understand how the applicant is achieving teacher buy-in of the PD program that requires 36 hours of training in the summer and 16 hours of follow-on in the academic year even when the online version is used. (e22)

Reader's Score:

Strategy to Scale - Strategy to Scale

1. **The Secretary considers the applicant's strategy to scale the proposed project. In determining the applicant's capacity to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

Reader's Score: 17

Sub

1. **(1) The extent to which the applicant identifies a specific strategy or strategies that address a particular barrier or barriers that prevented the applicant, in the past, from reaching the level of scale that is proposed in the application.**

   Strengths:

   Training mentors to then go back to the participating states to provide the PD training to the teachers is a way to ensure more teachers have access to the program without having to travel away from home to get it. Coordinators working with school leaders to show how the proposed civics program can be incorporated into existing plans and budgets could have a positive affect on teacher support and increased awareness. (e26)

   Weaknesses:

   The applicant makes the point that teachers need more civics PD, More information is needed to understand if there is currently a lack of civic learning professional development available or just a lack of usage.(e24)

   Reader's Score:

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

   Strengths:

   The applicant plans to host a webpage that will link to all the online PD as well as the evaluation results. Having such quick access to the results makes it available and useful to all stakeholders. Hosting webinars and reaching over 70,000 in a monthly newsletter has the potential to be a high quality way to gain support for further development. (e28)

   Weaknesses:

   With the proposal's main focus on educating their target population on understanding civics so as to bridge the gap with political influence between them and more privileged groups, there seems to a lack of information to address dissemination of the results in civic and political arenas. (e29)

   Reader's Score:

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: 16

   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.**

      Strengths:

      : Much attention was given by the applicant to focus their PD on the elements of effective training. Materials are developed specially for use for English learners, students with disabilities and students of color. (e30)

      Weaknesses:

      More supporting evidence is needed to understand the amount of increase in students' political participation and future voting levels with participation in a civics program. (e29)

      Reader's Score:

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

      Strengths:

      The applicant uses pre-and post-surveys, classroom observations, and teacher interviews as effective measurement tools. The applicant focuses on the evaluation of the costs, comparing with other civics and SEL interventions. (e32) Evaluations of coordinators and mentors will be conducted using online surveys. (e138)

      Weaknesses:

      On Table J.9.2, more concrete and specific information is needed to evaluate the improvement in civic dispositions and the SEL competencies in addition to surveys.

      Reader's Score:

   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.**

      Strengths:

      The Center is collaborating with 30 experienced teachers that serve English learners, students of color, and students with disabilities. The center and the teachers will develop the PD and the instructional support materials for these groups. Having the teachers as part of the development, seems to be an effective way to ensure the needs of the target population are met. (e34)

Sub

    Weaknesses:

More information is needed to understand that spending 40 or more instructional hours on a civics program is the best usage allocation of the target populations classroom social studies time for the school year. (e35)

    Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

1. **The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources and 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: **18**

    Sub

    1. **(1) The applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to bring the proposed project to scale on a national or regional level (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)) working directly, or through partners, during the grant period.**

        Strengths:

The Center brings together a management team of experienced and proven professionals. Members have managed large federally funded grants on a national level. Partners have successful experience providing PD. The center has measures in place for receiving regular report on progress as well as twice-yearly formal reports. (e37)

        Weaknesses:

        Reader's Score:

    2. **(2) 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 project management team will have the advantage to be supported by the Center's other departments such as accounting and IT. The timeline provided seems sufficient and well organized, identifying the key personnel in charge. The timeline spans four years with the center anticipating requesting a one-year extension giving sufficient time allocations to accomplish the objectives. (e40)

        Weaknesses:

        Reader's Score:

    3. **(3) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project.**

Sub

    Strengths:

The applicant is focused on cost-effective measures and consulted with state coordinators and others to gather information on other's experiences with what is reasonable. The design of the program is one in which states may implement in subsequent years, at no additional cost to the grant, bringing the cost per student down even further. (e42)

    Weaknesses:

As the PD training is currently designed, it requires significant training hours to implement. More information is needed to help understand that school leaders are committed to allocating that amount of teacher training toward civic education. (e43)

    Reader's Score:

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:

    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 without reservations as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbook (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)).**

    Strengths:

    Weaknesses:

    Reader's Score:

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

    Strengths:

    Weaknesses:

    Reader's Score:

Sub

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.**

    Strengths:

    Weaknesses:

    Reader's Score:

Priority Questions

CPP1 - Computer Science

1. **Projects designed to improve student achievement or other educational outcomes in computer science (as defined in this notice). These projects must address the following priority area: Expanding access to and participation in rigorous computer science coursework for traditionally underrepresented students such as racial or ethnic minorities, women, students in communities served by rural local educational agencies (as defined in this notice), children or students with disabilities (as defined in this notice), or low-income individuals (as defined under section 312(g) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended).**

    Strengths:

    Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/10/2021 04:49 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Center for Civic Education (S411B210038)
Reader #2:   **********

		Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions			
Selection Criteria			
Significance			
1. Significance		15	15
	Sub Total	15	15
Strategy to Scale			
Strategy to Scale			
1. Strategy to Scale		20	18
	Sub Total	20	18
Selection Criteria			
Quality of Project Design			
1. Project Design		20	14
Adequacy of Resources			
1. Quality of the Management		20	15
Quality of the Project Evaluation			
1. Project Evaluation		25	
	Sub Total	65	29
Priority Questions			
CPP1			
Computer Science			
1. Computer Science		5	
	Sub Total	5	
	Total	105	62

Technical Review Form

Reader #2:   **************

Applicant: Center for Civic Education (S411B210038)

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 factors:**

Reader's Score: **15**

   Sub

1. **(1) The national significance of the proposed project.**

   Strengths:

   This proposal addresses national needs relevant for under resourced students and the broader national need related to SEL and civics learning. It also addresses the need for access to more effective and relevant professional learning for educators and professional learning that incorporates teacher mentorship and other capacity-building that drives sustainability.

   Weaknesses:

   No weaknesses were noted.

   Reader's Score:

2. **(2) The potential contribution of the proposed project to increased knowledge or understanding of educational problems, issues, or effective strategies.**

   Strengths:

   This proposal is based on strong evidence of the curriculum's effectiveness from early phase/SEED grant. It includes differentiation by students of color, SWDs, and ELLs. It emphasizes evaluating the impact of professional learning for educators as well as including specific adult learning outcomes and practices such as online professional learning and teacher-led virtual professional learning communities. It is strengthened by emphasis on learning from the previous SEED grant and on filling a gap in research in civics education and SEL as potentially reinforcing.

   Weaknesses:

   No weaknesses were noted.

   Reader's Score:

Strategy to Scale - Strategy to Scale

1. **The Secretary considers the applicant's strategy to scale the proposed project. In determining the applicant's capacity to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

Reader's Score: 18

    Sub

1. **(1) The extent to which the applicant identifies a specific strategy or strategies that address a particular barrier or barriers that prevented the applicant, in the past, from reaching the level of scale that is proposed in the application.**

    Strengths:

    This proposal includes a strong emphasis on evaluating elements that would be important drivers of state and district buy-in such as reducing costs and showing impact on standards-aligned learning. It also includes a strong emphasis on teacher-led professional development and supports and a more flexible PD model, all relevant for addressing barriers to scale.

    Weaknesses:

    This proposal does not include a discussion of target populations professional learning and curriculum and their applicability to a variety of school settings and education landscapes, which may be limited.

    Reader's Score:

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

    Strengths:

    This proposal includes a strong emphasis on communicating with SEAs and making a research-informed case to build their buy-in. It has a strong plan for leveraging the proposer's existing network of partnerships in each state and inclusion of a wide variety of field building organizations including those focused on SEL and civics education.

    Weaknesses:

    No weaknesses were noted.

    Reader's Score:

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: 14

    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.**

Strengths:

This proposal shows a strong emphasis on reducing barriers to teacher participation in professional learning and a grounding in adult learning principles, as shown on pg e27. It also establishes clear connections between the details of the study and the overall goals with a strong grounding in relevant research on civics education and integration of SEL.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score:

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

   Strengths:

   The proposal's emphasis on evaluating change in teacher content knowledge and efficacy is a strong element, as is it's focus on SEL teacher implementation and student outcomes.

   Weaknesses:

   It is unclear what frameworks or research or best practice will serve as the foundation for differentiated supports to educators serving SWDs, ELLs, and students of color described in this proposal (although the proposers do have a plan to pilot and iterate on these differentiated supports.

   Reader's Score:

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.**

   Strengths:

   The proposal generally reflects strong inclusion of practices and professional learning that will support educators to create more inclusive classrooms.

   Weaknesses:

   The development of targeted population professional development and curriculum adjustment is not fully addressed but is framed as an essential justification for the study.

   Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

1. **The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources and 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: 15

   Sub

   1. **(1) The applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or**

Sub

management capacity) to bring the proposed project to scale on a national or regional level (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)) working directly, or through partners, during the grant period.

Strengths:

This proposal includes description of a strong team and effective resource allocation. It also includes a strong plan for partnership with expertise and capacity related to implementation and dissemination of findings.

Weaknesses:

This proposal's plan for expert consultant capacity related to targeted populations professional development and curriculum development is not sufficient.

Reader's Score:

2. **(2) 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 proposer has a strong track record of leading similar initiatives and an effective network of partnerships that includes a wide variety of stakeholders, as shown on pg e38. This supports a timeline that is generally effective for execution of this study.

Weaknesses:

The described three months to develop a draft of the target population professional learning and curriculum may not be adequate and could affect the overall timeline of this project.

Reader's Score:

3. **(3) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project.**

Strengths:

This proposal has a strong basis in feedback from partners and other stakeholders regarding costs/resource allocation. It also makes a strong argument for return on investment, as shown on pg e43.

Weaknesses:

The proposed budget for contractual costs related to a professional learning platform and expert consultants is not sufficient based on industry standard. This could lead to a broader impact on the budget as a whole.

Reader's Score:

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:

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 without reservations as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbook (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)).**

   Strengths:

   Weaknesses:

   Reader's Score:

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

   Strengths:

   Weaknesses:

   Reader's Score:

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.**

   Strengths:

   Weaknesses:

   Reader's Score:

Priority Questions

CPP1 - Computer Science

1. **Projects designed to improve student achievement or other educational outcomes in computer science (as defined in this notice). These projects must address the following priority area: Expanding access to and participation in rigorous computer science coursework for traditionally underrepresented students such as racial or ethnic minorities, women, students in communities served by rural local educational agencies (as defined in this notice), children or students with disabilities (as defined in this notice), or low-income individuals (as defined under section 312(g) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended).**

   Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/10/2021 12:25 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Center for Civic Education (S411B210038)
Reader #3:   **********

		Points Possible	**Points Scored**
Questions			
Selection Criteria			
Significance			
1. Significance		15	
	Sub Total	15	
Strategy to Scale			
Strategy to Scale			
1. Strategy to Scale		20	
	Sub Total	20	
Selection Criteria			
Quality of Project Design			
1. Project Design		20	
Adequacy of Resources			
1. Quality of the Management		20	
Quality of the Project Evaluation			
1. Project Evaluation		25	20
	Sub Total	65	20
Priority Questions			
CPP1			
Computer Science			
1. Computer Science		5	
	Sub Total	5	
	Total	105	20

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - EIR Mid-Phase - 3: 84.411B

Reader #3:   **********

Applicant: Center for Civic Education (S411B210038)

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 factors:**

Reader's Score:

    Sub

  1. **(1) The national significance of the proposed project.**

     Strengths:

     Weaknesses:

     Reader's Score:

  2. **(2) The potential contribution of the proposed project to increased knowledge or understanding of educational problems, issues, or effective strategies.**

     Strengths:

     Weaknesses:

     Reader's Score:

Strategy to Scale - Strategy to Scale

1. **The Secretary considers the applicant's strategy to scale the proposed project. In determining the applicant's capacity to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

Reader's Score:

    Sub

1. **(1) The extent to which the applicant identifies a specific strategy or strategies that address a particular barrier or barriers that prevented the applicant, in the past, from reaching the level of scale that is proposed in the application.**

    Strengths:

    Weaknesses:

    Reader's Score:

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

    Strengths:

    Weaknesses:

    Reader's Score:

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:

    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.**

    Strengths:

    Weaknesses:

    Reader's Score:

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

Sub

    Strengths:

    Weaknesses:

    Reader's Score:

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.**

    Strengths:

    Weaknesses:

    Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

1. **The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources and 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:

    Sub

1. **(1) The applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to bring the proposed project to scale on a national or regional level (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)) working directly, or through partners, during the grant period.**

    Strengths:

    Weaknesses:

    Reader's Score:

2. **(2) 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:

Sub

    Weaknesses:

    Reader's Score:

3. **(3) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project.**

    Strengths:

    Weaknesses:

    Reader's Score:

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: **20**

    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 without reservations as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbook (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)).**

    Strengths:

    The applicant has partnered with Georgetown University's Civic Education Research Lab (CERL) as the independent and external evaluators for this project (pg. e22) whose researchers are well-experienced in WWC standards which require randomized controlled trials (pg. e38). This evaluation will employ a school-level RCT design of middle and high school civics teachers and students (pp. e46). There are three evaluation comparison studies based on student population – students of color, students with disabilities, and English language students. The evaluation will consist of teacher civics knowledge, pedagogy, and SEL strategies, and student civics knowledge and SEL skill acquisition. Teacher outcomes employ acceptable outcome measurements under the WWC standards (pg. e47). The applicant and CERL present a relationship collaborating on the implementation and fidelity of the project as demonstrated by the management team communication and inclusion (Table 3, pp. e40-41). 12 points earned.

    Weaknesses:

    CERL has not presented IRB/Human Subject research involvement, characteristics, and strategies for maintaining consent and managing data records. There is a passing reference to attrition or recruitment challenges and how issues that might arise around those will be addressed. High attrition is a viable threat in RCT evaluation and therefore should be included in the application. It will be difficult to find a school that meets the 30% criteria for students with disabilities as indicated in the proposal.

Reader's Score:

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

   Strengths:

   The James Madison Legacy Project's We the People curriculum approach targets middle and high school students, particularly students of color, students with disabilities, and English Language students, with comprehensive civics and SEL intervention and the evaluation proposed estimates the impact on teacher effectiveness, student socio-emotional learning, and student civic academic achievement (pg. e44). This is a replication study adding to the current research demonstrating effectiveness of the We the People curriculum on SEL outcomes for disadvantaged student populations, thus a positive impact measured by this evaluation will significantly inform others about this strategy in various grade levels and school locations. Additionally, the applicant provides power and sample size minimal detectable effect sizes for 80 schools for students of color, 40 schools for students with disabilities, and 40 schools for English language students (pg. e139). 4 points earned.

   Weaknesses:

   Dissemination is only mentioned as on the Georgetown website however this limits the exposure and adoption. More details are needed within the application to address unanticipated problems, such as attrition issues for such an at-risk population of students or delays/changes to the implementation of the curriculum, other than fidelity assurance. Those issues are considerable with respect to replication and testing in other settings.

   Reader's Score:

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.**

   Strengths:

   The external evaluator also will conduct a cost-effective analysis to ensure that this implementation is able to be reasonably implemented to scale (pg. e44). Key project components, mediators, outcomes, and thresholds for implementation are clearly presented in the evaluation plan (pp. e49-51). Relevant student subgroups, such as students of color, students with disabilities, and English Language (EL) students will be isolated in the model allowing for a strong impact analysis on those at-risk student subgroups. Appendix J (pg. e182) provides reasonable expectations for outcomes and deliverables for this project. This appendix also includes the roles and responsibilities of each member of the CERL evaluation team and the parts of the evaluation and analysis plan. 4 points earned.

   Weaknesses:

   Covariates at the teacher and school levels were not as detailed in the evaluation model that would be mediators to the impact and effectiveness of the WTP program.

   Reader's Score:

Priority Questions

CPP1 - Computer Science

1. **Projects designed to improve student achievement or other educational outcomes in computer science (as defined in this notice). These projects must address the following priority area: Expanding access to and participation in rigorous computer science coursework for traditionally underrepresented students such as racial or ethnic minorities, women, students in communities served by rural local educational agencies (as defined in this notice), children or students with disabilities (as defined in this notice), or low-income individuals (as defined**

under section 312(g) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended).

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/09/2021 04:06 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Center for Civic Education (S411B210038)
Reader #4: **********

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	15	
Sub Total	15	
Strategy to Scale		
Strategy to Scale		
1. Strategy to Scale	20	
Sub Total	20	
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	20	
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Quality of the Management	20	
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	25	21
Sub Total	65	21
Priority Questions		
CPP1		
Computer Science		
1. Computer Science	5	
Sub Total	5	
Total	105	21

Technical Review Form

Reader #4:   **********

Applicant: Center for Civic Education (S411B210038)

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 factors:**

Reader's Score:

   Sub

  1. **(1) The national significance of the proposed project.**

     Strengths:

     Weaknesses:

     Reader's Score:

  2. **(2) The potential contribution of the proposed project to increased knowledge or understanding of educational problems, issues, or effective strategies.**

     Strengths:

     Weaknesses:

     Reader's Score:

Strategy to Scale - Strategy to Scale

1. **The Secretary considers the applicant's strategy to scale the proposed project. In determining the applicant's capacity to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

Reader's Score:

> **Sub**

> 1. **(1) The extent to which the applicant identifies a specific strategy or strategies that address a particular barrier or barriers that prevented the applicant, in the past, from reaching the level of scale that is proposed in the application.**

> > **Strengths:**

> > **Weaknesses:**

> > **Reader's Score:**

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

> > **Strengths:**

> > **Weaknesses:**

> > **Reader's Score:**

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:

> **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.**

> > **Strengths:**

> > **Weaknesses:**

> > **Reader's Score:**

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

Sub

    Strengths:

    Weaknesses:

    Reader's Score:

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.**

    Strengths:

    Weaknesses:

    Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

1. **The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources and 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:

    Sub

1. **(1) The applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to bring the proposed project to scale on a national or regional level (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)) working directly, or through partners, during the grant period.**

    Strengths:

    Weaknesses:

    Reader's Score:

2. **(2) 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:

Sub

    Weaknesses:

    Reader's Score:

3. **(3) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project.**

    Strengths:

    Weaknesses:

    Reader's Score:

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: **21**

    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 without reservations as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbook (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)).**

    Strengths:

    The applicant clearly states six research question – 4 teacher-focused and 2 student-focused – on p.e45. A solid plan for a cluster-RCT is described, using three blocks of schools recruited based on their concentrations of three specific student subgroups. (p.e46) The goal of recruiting 160 schools across 12 states is ambitious, and will provide a well-powered research design given they are estimating only 30 students per teacher which is likely to be an underestimate for high school teachers. The researchers present a reasonable plan for minimizing attrition (Appendix J7) and preventing contamination. Expanding in year 3 to states with high concentrations of EL students (i.e. Georgia, New Mexico, Oklahoma) is a strong approach to meeting recruitment targets for that study group. The students' civic and SEL outcomes included are eligible under WWC review protocols

    Weaknesses:

    Appendix J1 states the applicant's goal of recruiting "schools with civics teachers who instruct high concentrations (>30%) of students in a category", and later states "14% of public school students in 19/20 received special education services". (p.e136) The applicant does not provide convincing evidence of their ability to find 80 schools (for the Year 2 impact study focused on SWD) with concentrations of SWD more than twice the national average. Further, SWD are often not distributed evenly across social studies teachers depending on their approach to inclusion (e.g. co-taught v. self-contained)

    In addition, the applicant does not provide adequate detail about a plan to monitor representativeness of clusters in terms of student scores on researcher-administered assessments.

Sub

Reader's Score:

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

Strengths:

Tracking teachers' use of PD through user analytics metrics associated with online platforms is an excellent approach for documenting strategies to support replication. (p.e149)Teacher interviews are also a solid plan for documenting barriers and accelerators to implementation that can inform future testing in other settings. The applicant plans to include survey instruments and evaluation details on the CERL website.

Weaknesses:

While the teacher interviews will provide valuable information, the applicant states classroom observations will only occur with 'a minimum of two teachers per state', which equals 16 teachers in year 2 and 24 teachers in year 3. With 160 schools in the study, estimating 3-4 teachers per school (based on logic model in Appendix G) this represents a tiny portion of the teachers participating.(p.e138)

While including all of the evaluation information on Georgetown's website would be helpful to researchers, the applicant provides limited detail about how the results of this project can be disseminated to practitioners in the areas of civics and government seeking to replicate this approach in other settings. It would have been helpful if the applicant included information beyond their plan for sharing effective evaluation strategies, and included a plan for sharing effective implementation strategies.

Reader's Score:

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.**

Strengths:

The applicant provides a description of mediators, such as school locale and teacher experience, in Appendix J2, p.e137. The applicant plans to use teacher measures validated through their previous SEED grant, which demonstrated strong reliability. (p.e143 & e146) A measurable threshold for implementation is provided on p.e150 with comprehensive details (Table J.9.1) about how it will be calculated. The logic model details key project inputs and activities as well as short and long term outcomes. (Appendix G)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score:

Priority Questions

CPP1 - Computer Science

1. **Projects designed to improve student achievement or other educational outcomes in computer science (as defined in this notice). These projects must address the following priority area: Expanding access to and participation in rigorous computer science coursework for traditionally underrepresented students such as racial or ethnic minorities, women, students in**

communities served by rural local educational agencies (as defined in this notice), children or students with disabilities (as defined in this notice), or low-income individuals (as defined under section 312(g) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended).

 Strengths:

 Weaknesses:

 Reader's Score:

_____

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/09/2021 03:35 PM