

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/23/2018 09:40 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: National Center for Families Learning (U310A180040)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	28
Quality of Management Plan/Project Personnel		
1. Management/Personel	20	16
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Resources	20	20
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	30	0
Sub Total	100	64
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
Competitive Preference Priority 1a or 1b		
1. CPP 1(a) or CPP 1(b)	3	0
Sub Total	3	0
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
1. CPP 2	3	3
Sub Total	3	3
Total	106	67

Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - SFEC - 5: 84.310A

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: National Center for Families Learning (U310A180040)

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—

- (1) The extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework.
- (2) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project reflect up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice.
- (3) The extent to which the proposed project is designed to build capacity and yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance.

Strengths:

- 1) The applicant is an experienced family engagement and literacy services program developer/provider and presents a proven framework with a 3 tier approach – Community initiatives, professional development and site based programming to increase student achievement. P. e22. These elements are clearly defined with details regarding activities, participation and anticipated goals. For example: “Adult Education (3-4 hours per week) The purpose of adult education is for parents to achieve education goals such as: 1) English language acquisition, 2) high school equivalency, 3) literacy education, 4) financial literacy, 5) college preparation for parents and for their children, and 6) building strong technology skills. This fulfills the federal definition of family literacy by providing parent literacy training that leads to economic self-sufficiency.”
- 2) The applicant cites several relevant studies to support the varied components of this project such as “research that shows parents and caretakers have the greatest influence on the academic trajectories of their children, and that strong parent-child and parent-school relationships are catalytic to educational progress, particularly for disadvantaged families from diverse backgrounds (Henderson, Mapp, Johnson, & Davies, 2007).” P. 4-6
- 3) This project includes a train-the-trainer approach which helps to build capacity and sustain the program as it is implemented. p. e31. An advisory committee with active representation and ongoing involvement in local and national conferences is also geared toward sustaining the project beyond the grant period. Funding to continue this work will be solicited from long standing financial support from major foundations and organizations. P. e32

Weaknesses:

2. Research cited is 5-10 years old and may not fully address the current needs and/or communication methods for the target population of students and families.

Reader's Score: 28

Selection Criteria - Quality of Management Plan/Project Personnel

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the services to be provided by the proposed project. In determining the quality of project personnel, the Secretary considers 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, in determining the quality of the management plan and project personnel, the Secretary considers—

- (1) How the applicant will ensure that a diversity of perspectives are brought to bear in the operation of the proposed project, including those of parents, teachers, the business community, a variety of disciplinary and professional fields, recipients or beneficiaries of services, or others, as appropriate.
- (2) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project involve the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project services.
- (3) 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.
- (4) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel.

Strengths:

- 1) The applicant describes the elements of ensuring diverse perspectives and they include collaborations with relevant groups and organizations; an advisory committee of community stakeholders which includes students and parents; a digital network for parent statewide; and parent training centers. Specific recruitment of parents of children with special needs is also described. pp. e32-33.
- 2) Collaboration and support from Make Way for Books, Arizona Child Care Administration, and Read on Arizona is outlined with documentation. P. e24-25 and e79-81 Project activities and responsibilities relevant to these partners are detailed in the program design. Collaboration of activities is well woven into the project and designed to maximize effectiveness. For example: "SWHD, MWFB, and ROA will offer early childhood community trainings in each region where demonstration sites are located through an eight-week program that shares the importance of early language and literacy skill development and how parents can support their children. Ten trainings will be held for disadvantaged families annually at each site, resulting in at least 300 families served per year." P. e24
- 3) A comprehensive organizational chart details the management and leadership with clear roles and responsibilities for the project. A full time coordinator is planned for implementation. A timeline and clear logic model is also provided and clearly illustrates the project goals and anticipated outcomes.
- 4) Personnel are well qualified and documentation is provided.

Weaknesses:

- 1) Details are lacking regarding the roles of the various stakeholders and the activities of the advisory committee. It is not clear how these individuals and/or groups will be involved with the program in a manner that will ensure diverse perspectives.
- 2) None
- 3) Project management for the entire state of Arizona may require more than the .15 fte director and 1 fte coordinator to fully implement this project to full effectiveness.
- 4) none

Reader's Score: 16

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

1. **The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources for the proposed project. In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers—**
 - (1) **The relevance and demonstrated commitment of each partner in the proposed project to the implementation and success of the project.**
 - (2) **The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project.**
 - (3) **The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the number of persons to be served and the anticipated results and benefits.**

Strengths:

- 1) Partner commitments with details regarding services, historically and ongoing, are provided for each partner. MOUs and support letters are provided for partners. Partner roles and contributions to program are described with detail and indicate a clear collaborative plan. P. e47-50
- 2) A cost analysis is provided and illustrates a reasonable budget to meet the project objectives and provide quality services. P. e49
- 3) Details regarding the population of students/families to be served are described in relation to program needs. A cost/benefit analysis if briefly describes and indicates a reasonable cost per person to achieve the anticipated outcomes. P. e51

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 20

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:**
 - (1) **The extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible.**
 - (2) **The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.**
 - (3) **The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce promising evidence (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)) about the project's effectiveness.**

Strengths:

n/a

Weaknesses:

n/a

Reader's Score: 0

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority 1 - Competitive Preference Priority 1a or 1b

1. **The Secretary gives priority to projects that are designed to--**
 - (a) **Create SFECs that will provide direct services to parents and families through evidence-based (as defined in the notice inviting applications, NIA) activities.**
 - (b) **Provide families with evidence-based (as defined in the NIA) strategies for promoting literacy. This may include providing families with access to books or other physical or digital materials or content about how to support their child's reading development, or providing family literacy activities (as defined in section 203(9) of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act).**

Note: An application will not receive points for both (a) and (b) under Competitive Preference Priority 1.

Strengths:

n/a

Weaknesses:

n/a

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority 2 - Competitive Preference Priority 2

- 1. The Secretary gives priority to projects that are designed to provide families with the information and tools they need to make important decisions regarding the educational choice (as defined in the NIA) that is most appropriate for their children.**

Strengths:

The applicant address this priority with an initiative which will promote positive educational choices for disadvantaged families through evidence-based family literacy strategies. This includes a key goal "GOAL TWO: Empower parents of disadvantaged students with the information and tools to make good choices for their child's education"

Weaknesses:

None found.

Reader's Score: 3

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/23/2018 09:40 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/19/2018 01:08 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: National Center for Families Learning (U310A180040)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	25
Quality of Management Plan/Project Personnel		
1. Management/Personel	20	20
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Resources	20	18
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	30	0
Sub Total	100	63
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
Competitive Preference Priority 1a or 1b		
1. CPP 1(a) or CPP 1(b)	3	0
Sub Total	3	0
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
1. CPP 2	3	3
Sub Total	3	3
Total	106	66

Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - SFEC - 5: 84.310A

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: National Center for Families Learning (U310A180040)

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—

- (1) The extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework.
- (2) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project reflect up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice.
- (3) The extent to which the proposed project is designed to build capacity and yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance.

Strengths:

- 1) The quality of the framework proposed is a 3-tier intervention model with activities focusing on adult education, parent education, children's education and parent-child intergenerational literacy experiences. The intervention model demonstrates a comprehensive approach where parents have an opportunity to achieve their own educational goals, a targeted focus on increasing instruction time for children and additional support for parents on how to assist their children at home (e22-23).
- 2) The project design provides supporting evidence on the importance of culturally relevant books and access to digital library to families. This demonstrates that the project design understands the needs of diverse families and access to the right type of books that can engage both parent and child and increase literacy skills (e25).
- 3) The project design builds capacity of families and stakeholders by offering community trainings in early language and literacy skill development and necessary support to parents. This will occur annually targeting 300 families per year. This strategy will result in impact on families and community stakeholders beyond the funding period(e25).

Weaknesses:

- 1) The project design conceptual framework describes the implementation of 3 LEA demonstration sites that will serve as "hubs" offering a menu of services targeting disadvantaged students, but it's unclear and there is no supporting evidence on how they identify the partner schools and if the number of third grade students struggling with reading connects to the potential locations for year one.(e22).
- 2) No weakness
- 3) No weakness

Reader's Score: 25

Selection Criteria - Quality of Management Plan/Project Personnel

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the services to be provided by the proposed project. In determining the quality of project personnel, the Secretary considers 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, in determining the quality of the management plan and project personnel, the Secretary considers—

- (1) How the applicant will ensure that a diversity of perspectives are brought to bear in the operation of the proposed project, including those of parents, teachers, the business community, a variety of disciplinary and professional fields, recipients or beneficiaries of services, or others, as appropriate.
- (2) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project involve the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project services.
- (3) 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.
- (4) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel.

Strengths:

- 1) The applicant describes establishment of state and district level parent leadership councils that will provide feedback on service delivery and provide opportunities for parents to be involved in continued development and progress family engagement activities. The digital statewide parent-to-parent network will provide opportunities for parents to network with other parents and share best practices. In addition, a statewide advisory committee will consist of a variety of stakeholders consisting of majority parents, but inclusive of educators, students, SEA, LEA and community business members to share a wide range of perspectives and guidance (e33).
- 2) The appropriate partners are identified and roles and responsibilities are well-connected with goals and objectives. The partners will contribute not only to the effectiveness of the program, but provides evidence of knowledge and expertise of family engagement activities (e22-e29).
- 3) The timeline and project milestones provide clear objectives that align with each 3-tier goal and when family engagement activities will be offered year-to-year (e35-45).
- 4) Adequate information on personnel is provided, including description of each role & responsibilities, resumes (e93-e112), and organizational chart (e117) are all evident in the proposal.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were found

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

1. The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources for the proposed project. In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers—

- (1) The relevance and demonstrated commitment of each partner in the proposed project to the implementation and success of the project.
- (2) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project.
- (3) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the number of persons to be served and the anticipated results and benefits.

Strengths:

- 1) There is commitment from one of the collaborative partners to develop an online Parent Information Center using their existing MapLIT data center to share school performance data with parents. This demonstrates the commitment to use existing resource to enhance and impact project goals and objectives (e27). In addition, signed MOUs from collaborative partners are included in proposal (e84-e93).
- 2) The budget narrative provides sufficient details that provides costs that are reasonable as it relates to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project (e119).

3) Contributions of \$30,000 annually to financially support LEAs, years 2-5 and core partners will contribute \$90,000 of combined annual in kind expenses demonstrates the level of commitment to the success of project (e124).

Weaknesses:

- 1) No weakness
- 2) No weakness
- 3) No evidence of matching funds or other sources of funding to sustain the project beyond the funding period (e123).

Reader's Score: 18

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:

- (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible.
- (2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.
- (3) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce promising evidence (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)) about the project's effectiveness.

Strengths:

NA

Weaknesses:

NA

Reader's Score: 0

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority 1 - Competitive Preference Priority 1a or 1b

1. The Secretary gives priority to projects that are designed to--

- (a) Create SFECs that will provide direct services to parents and families through evidence-based (as defined in the notice inviting applications, NIA) activities.
- (b) Provide families with evidence-based (as defined in the NIA) strategies for promoting literacy. This may include providing families with access to books or other physical or digital materials or content about how to support their child's reading development, or providing family literacy activities (as defined in section 203(9) of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act).

Note: An application will not receive points for both (a) and (b) under Competitive Preference Priority 1.

Strengths:

NA

Weaknesses:

NA

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority 2 - Competitive Preference Priority 2

- 1. The Secretary gives priority to projects that are designed to provide families with the information and tools they need to make important decisions regarding the educational choice (as defined in the NIA) that is most appropriate for their children.**

Strengths:

The project provides a clear objective on providing families with the resources needed to make informed educational choices through evidenced based literacy strategies in collaboration with partners with expertise and content knowledge (e18).

The project has a long standing history of providing families with placed-based family literacy programming by using a four component approach, which not only provides families needed resources, but parents increase their own capacity to better support their children's learning (e20).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 3

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/19/2018 01:08 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/23/2018 11:25 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: National Center for Families Learning (U310A180040)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	0
Quality of Management Plan/Project Personnel		
1. Management/Personel	20	0
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Resources	20	0
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	30	21
Sub Total	100	21
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
Competitive Preference Priority 1a or 1b		
1. CPP 1(a) or CPP 1(b)	3	3
Sub Total	3	3
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
1. CPP 2	3	0
Sub Total	3	0
Total	106	24

Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - SFEC - 5: 84.310A

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: National Center for Families Learning (U310A180040)

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—
 - (1) The extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework.
 - (2) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project reflect up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice.
 - (3) The extent to which the proposed project is designed to build capacity and yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance.

Strengths:

Not Applicable

Weaknesses:

Not Applicable

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of Management Plan/Project Personnel

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the services to be provided by the proposed project. In determining the quality of project personnel, the Secretary considers 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, in determining the quality of the management plan and project personnel, the Secretary considers—
 - (1) How the applicant will ensure that a diversity of perspectives are brought to bear in the operation of the proposed project, including those of parents, teachers, the business community, a variety of disciplinary and professional fields, recipients or beneficiaries of services, or others, as appropriate.
 - (2) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project involve the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project services.
 - (3) 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.
 - (4) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel.

Strengths:

Not Applicable

Weaknesses:

Not Applicable

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

1. The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources for the proposed project. In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers—

- (1) The relevance and demonstrated commitment of each partner in the proposed project to the implementation and success of the project.**
- (2) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project.**
- (3) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the number of persons to be served and the anticipated results and benefits.**

Strengths:

Not Applicable

Weaknesses:

Not Applicable

Reader's Score: 0

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:

- (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible.**
- (2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.**
- (3) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce promising evidence (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)) about the project's effectiveness.**

Strengths:

- 1) a) Applicant provides a plan (p. 37) to assess both the impact of the program (on parent behaviors and student academic outcomes) and the implementation of the program (i.e., fidelity to the program plan).
 - b) Applicant provides a comprehensive plan (p. 40-45) to collect data across multiple variables, from varied stakeholder groups, via multiple types of data. Data sources are clearly aligned with program objectives.
 - c) Applicant specifies how several key variables will be defined (p. 38). For example, participation in the program is defined as "number of total hours of all activities over a school year" as opposed to a simple yes or no.
 - d) Applicant is clear about how instruments and items are structured, such as Likert scales or open-ended questions (p. 39).
- 2) a) Applicant plans for regular dissemination of formative data with stakeholders (p. 46), thus allowing for program correction and improvement.

- 3) a) Family Interview protocols go beyond simple assessments of time spent on literacy activities to include more complex issues such as parents' perceptions of their ability to help their children in school and their beliefs about their responsibility for their children's educations (p. 38).
- b) Applicant states that demonstrable impact of the program will require a moderate to strong correlation (p. 45).
- c) Analyses will include correlations of parental program engagement and student academic outcomes (p. 46).

Weaknesses:

1) a) Several of the means of data analysis listed in the data table are not clear. For example, it is stated that "list of at-home literacy practices" is assessed by "comparison to targets" (p. 40), but it is not indicated what these targets are or how (and by whom) they have been defined.

2) a) When discussing assessment of fidelity (p. 37), applicant states that seven indicators will be measured against "Benchmarks" mean scores, but more information is needed. What defines a "high" fidelity level? Are these scores determined across all sites or at individual locations?

b) It is not clear that simply noting whether particular indicators are "observed or not" (p. 38) is sufficient—there is important difference between something simply existing versus that variable being judged against a particular standard.

c) Goal 3 is increasing the capacity to provide literacy and family engagement services (p. 44), but the applicant plans only to count numbers of trainings and participants. More complex and useful indicators of capacity for high-quality are needed beyond simple participation numbers.

3) a) Though several data elements are to be compared to a specific target (e.g., 80% of families reporting reading together 3 times a week, p. 40), it is not clear why these types of variables would be assessed only via comparison to a set target at the end of the year and not also via a comparison of growth. Additionally, some of these "comparison to target" plans do not make sense, such as SO 2.1a (41), which state that 80% of parents will report improved decision making, but then says the data is pre-/post. Logically, the pre-score cannot evaluate improvement.

b) SO 2.3 (p. 44) states that effective family-school partnerships to support student achievement will be assessed via analysis of agendas and records, but it is not clear what this analysis would be looking for and how these questions would be answered.

c) SO 2.4 does not indicate how hits on the website could then be directly tied to parents "reporting school decision making and support of their children" (p. 44).

d) Applicant states that correlational analyses will include 3 levels of the independent variable (participation in the program), but does not state what these levels are (low/medium/high, presumably?) or how they will be determined: will there be pre-set ranges or will the participants simply be divided into three groups regardless of variance?

Reader's Score: 21

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority 1 - Competitive Preference Priority 1a or 1b

1. The Secretary gives priority to projects that are designed to--

(a) Create SFECs that will provide direct services to parents and families through evidence-based (as defined in the notice inviting applications, NIA) activities.

(b) Provide families with evidence-based (as defined in the NIA) strategies for promoting literacy. This may include providing families with access to books or other physical or digital materials or content about how to support their child's reading development, or providing family literacy activities (as defined in section 203(9) of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act).

Note: An application will not receive points for both (a) and (b) under Competitive Preference Priority 1.

Strengths:

CPP1(b): Applicant plans to create literacy “hubs” at three LEA demonstration sites to provide evidence-based literacy services to families (p. 7). These will include direct services to families; literacy activities and resource to connect home, school, and community; and family support services to address potential participation barriers, such as child care, transportation, and food. The hubs will also offer professional development on these intervention for site staff, and will initially be targeted toward locations with high percentages of struggling 3rd grade readers.

Intervention Report and Practice Guide submitted as supporting evidence met requirements as laid out in NIA.

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 3

Competitive Preference Priority 2 - Competitive Preference Priority 2

- 1. The Secretary gives priority to projects that are designed to provide families with the information and tools they need to make important decisions regarding the educational choice (as defined in the NIA) that is most appropriate for their children.**

Strengths:

Not Applicable

Weaknesses:

Not Applicable

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/23/2018 11:25 AM