

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/24/2018 04:30 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: West River Foundation (U310A180043)

Reader #1: *****

	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	15
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Resources	20	20
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	30	0
Sub Total	100	60
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	1
Sub Total	3	1
Total	106	61

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - SFEC - 2: 84.310A

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: West River Foundation (U310A180043)

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 goals are guided by the work cited in Partners in Education: A Dual Capacity-Building Framework for Family-School Partnership. The framework align with the long-term outcomes of the applicant which are: effective stakeholder partnerships to support student learning, families effectively support their student' learning, positive transitions to post-secondary opportunities, and stakeholders learning family engagement strategies.(p. 5-6) The applicant will also use the framework from the Getting Ready program developed by the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. This evidence – based framework is child and parent focuses, strengths-based intervention designed for young children. The rationale for the selection of these frameworks is due to their similarity to each other and existing programs. Overall, the frameworks demonstrate that the proposed program will be based on evidence-based best practices. (p. 9-10)
- (2) The proposed services align strongly to the latest up-to-date research and effective practices. (p. 5-9) The services offered closely align to the Dual-Capacity-Building Framework. It is apparent that the applicant has designed a program in which the family is at the center and programs exist at every level to support the family and student.
- (3) The applicant has an adequate plan for building capacity. The state lost funding for its Parent's Information and Resource Center and organizations continued the programming as a measure of support for the initiative. Additionally, continued financial support from school districts has allowed the applicant to build capacity. (p. 17-18)

Weaknesses:

- (3) The applicant does not provide a convincing argument for their ability to build capacity. There was no indication if family engagement was not scaled down after it's only Parent's Information and Resource Center was closed. .

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 will ensure that more parental involvement takes place through their advisory committee. (p. 18)
- (2) The applicant has established solid partnerships with appropriate partners. For example, the applicant will work closely with Parent Connections who will implement statewide initiatives providing training to educators, parent, families and community-based organizations. (p. 20-23) Back Hills Career Learning Center will provide statewide initiatives focused on adult literacy, financial literacy and transitions into post-secondary education. (p. 23)
- (3) The applicant provides an adequate management which ensures the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget. For example, the community engagement specialist is a 1 FTE responsible for providing services for birth to 5, -12 for Tribal/BIE schools. (p. 17-23) The timeline and milestones align with the activities described in the narrative. The applicant will use the first month of the program to develop processes for distribution of literacy supports to parents and families. The chart providing these timelines and milestone is strong and could serve as a stand-alone document. (p. e121-e122)
- (4) The applicant demonstrates a highly qualified For example, the Director of Black Hills Special Services will serve as Principal Investigator. She has an Ed.D in Education Leaderships and has worked in leadership roles since 2010. Her background closely aligns with her responsibilities of overseeing the day-to-day operation of services. (p. 20-23, e65-e66) The Executive Director of the South Dakota Parent Connection has extensive leadership experience in Early Childhood education. She has over 18 years in the field of early childhood education. (p. e71)

Weaknesses:

- (1) The applicant did not sufficiently address this criteria. There was not intentional or strategic plan to discuss recruitment of parent(s)/caregivers. They applicant did not discuss how they will target families from Title I and disadvantaged schools, nor ethnic minorities or deaf families.
- (3) It was difficult to align the staff roles and responsibilities with a management timeline. The given timeline does not have assigned staff(p. e121-e122)

Reader's Score: 15

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) The applicant demonstrates the strong commitment of each partner and their ability to implement the project to success. The West River Foundation will provide financial oversight, programmatic responsibility and long-term commitment to sustain the project. (p. e57) The South Dakota Department of Education will provide staff time to work on statewide initiatives, develop family engagement resources, and work with all Title I schools to provide a focus on Family, Community, and Culture Engagement. (p. 24-25, e60)
- (2) The cost for the proposed project are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design and potential significance. The proposals outlines the budget per year and includes the match. These yearly cost are appropriate and illustrate judicious expenditures. For example, during the first year of full implementation the cost is \$885,033 with no match required. This cost aligns with the nature and scope of the services provided throughout the state. (p. 26-27)
- (3) The applicant demonstrates the reasonable cost of the project as it relates to the number of persons to be served. The applicant will train over 800 parents face-to-face or online to build learning, reach over 1,500 families per year face-to-face and provide resources and evidence-based strategies for promoting literacy, and offer regional training opportunities for 49 school districts. These are just a few of the services and represent a reasonable expenditures of funds. (p. 28-30)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses identified in this section.

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:

Not applicable

Weaknesses:

Not applicable

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:

Not applicable

Weaknesses:

Not applicable

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 will provide families with information and tools they need to make important decisions regarding educational choice. The applicant indicates that will develop, acquire and disseminate informational resources for families. (p. 8)

Weaknesses:

The applicant is vague on the information they will provide to families. Throughout the application little information is provide about educational choice which makes it difficult to give this criteria full points.

Reader's Score: 1

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/24/2018 04:30 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/22/2018 06:56 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: West River Foundation (U310A180043)

Reader #2: *****

	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	29
Sub Total	100	29
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	32

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - SFEC - 2: 84.310A

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: West River Foundation (U310A180043)

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:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

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:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

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:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

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)The applicant explains that their qualified external evaluator will conduct both a formative and summative evaluation to inform the strategic decisions of project growth. In addition, they state that they will collect and report the required GPRA Performance Measures. The logic model serves as the foundation for describing the overall evaluation which includes program activities and outputs. Included are the OUTCOMES and (related Capabilities, Connections, Confidence, and Cognition) then the actual Short Term, Mid-term, and Long-Term Outcomes. (pgs. 30-31, Logic Model, Appendix)

2) The applicant states that their summative evaluation will provide data and information to demonstrate the results/outcomes of their program. This will include short-term, mid-term and long-term outcomes and deliverables. The evaluator will develop a set of analysis conditions to guide data integration from the various data collection methods. There is a clear discussion about how the quantitative data will be analyzed and reported. The applicant clearly describes how they will collect baseline information and will use a comparison and control group. They discuss the use of baseline

data, they include statistical analysis and power function to help determine optimal group sizes in order to determine statistical significance. In the Work Plan, there are specific deliverables that are a part of the Comprehensive Evaluation Plan. (pgs. 32-34, Appendix)

3)The evaluation design includes details about how qualitative and quantitative data will be collected, when and how. There is a detailed analysis guide that clearly demonstrates the statistical analysis that the evaluator will use. There is a comprehensive description of the evaluation design, research design, and data analysis that meets the criteria of promising evidence as defined by the What Works Clearinghouse. The application includes a comprehensive guide to the overall evaluation process that clearly includes the relationship and how data will be collected and evaluated using the: Logic Model Outcome, Performance Measure, Methodology, and the Report Timeline. These are all organized by the Short, Mid, or Long-term Outcomes. In the Appendix, there is a detailed description of the external evaluator and details about who they are and what types of evaluations they have participated within the past. (pgs. 34-40, Appendix)

Weaknesses:

- 1) None noted
- 2) The applicant does not discuss continuous and ongoing reporting between the evaluator and project staff to discuss the results of the evaluation during the implementation of the project.
- 3) None noted

Reader's Score: 29

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:

CPP 1(b)

The applicant clearly identifies evidence-based research articles to demonstrate their source of information that supports the focus on increasing early literacy and family engagement resources for parents of children, Birth to K. They include the Partners in Education – A Dual Capacity-Building Framework for Family-School Partnership, and they provide detailed references that clearly address Early Literacy and family literacy activities that demonstrate promising evidence-based research, as defined by the What Works Clearing House. Including expressive language experiences that helped improve children identified as having a developmental concern (Sheridan, Knoche, Edwards, Bovaird, & Kupzyk, 2010; Sheridan, Knoche, Kupzyk, Edwards, & Marvin, 2011; Sheridan, Knoche, Edwards, Clarke, Kim, & Kupzyk, 2014). Additionally, data indicated that the Getting Ready intervention was effective at improving parenting behaviors known to support positive child outcomes and supports for their children's learning, and offered their children more appropriate guidance and directives (Knoche, Edwards, Sheridan, Kupzyk, Marvin, Cline, & Clarke, 2012). Finally, data indicated that the intervention was implemented with fidelity and received favorably by early childhood professionals (Knoche, Sheridan,

Edwards, & Osborn, 2010; Edwards, Hart, Rasmussen, Haw, & Sheridan, 2009; Brown, Knoche, Edwards, & Sheridan, 2009)

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:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/22/2018 06:56 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/24/2018 07:43 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: West River Foundation (U310A180043)

Reader #3: *****

	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	12
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Resources	20	20
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	30	0
Sub Total	100	57
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	2
Sub Total	3	2
Total	106	59

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - SFEC - 2: 84.310A

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: West River Foundation (U310A180043)

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:

The applicant plans to strengthen partnerships and improve student academic achievement. The applicant plans to support students' transition to adulthood as well as focus on early literacy. The applicant has an existing infrastructure and plans to build upon the work of the South Dakota Parent Resource Network. The project is based upon the expansion of its Bright Beginnings Project. The project is supported by a well structured logic model. The logic model is aligned to the relevant research and it is designed to enhance the capacity of staff and families. The applicant provides well-structured goals, objectives and outcomes. The applicant cites to research on the Getting Ready Intervention and literacy strategies. The applicant has experience in sustaining similar projects. The applicant plans to focus on students who need the most support in the lowest performing schools. (pp.2-11).

Weaknesses:

More information with regard to specific sustainable practices and a plan to leverage the resources of partners would strengthen this proposal. The applicant did not provide clear and convincing evidence to demonstrate how the proposed project is designed to build capacity.

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:

On pages 20-23, the applicant describes the qualifications of its management team. The applicant organization has a wealth of experience in implementing projects that include diverse perspectives. The applicant has a well-qualified management team. The time commitments of key project staff members are sufficient to implement the project. The applicant provides sufficient evidence to demonstrate the commitment of project partners.

Weaknesses:

An implementation plan with clearly delineated timelines and key project milestones would strengthen this proposal.

Reader's Score: 12

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:

The project will focus on four goals and 12 objectives. On pages 24-26, the applicant describes the commitments of key project partners. Partners will cover some of the personnel expenses and the outside evaluator has committed \$20,000 in in kind support. The applicant describes its in kind match on page 27. The applicant plans to train 800 parents, 800 administrators, 400 service providers and disseminate 3,000 resources. The applicant has a detailed budget. The applicant has identified 5 well-structured partnerships, including the South Dakota Parent Connection, South Dakota Department of Education, and the Black Hills Special Services Cooperative.

Weaknesses:

There were no weaknesses identified.

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 provides satisfactory detail in describing proposed project services designed to provide families with the information and tools they need to make important decisions regarding the educational choice that is most appropriate for their children.

Weaknesses:

More specific detail in describing project services to address this priority would strengthen this proposal.

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/24/2018 07:43 PM