

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/22/2018 01:07 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: The Ohio State University (U310A180049)

Reader #1: *****

	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	30
Sub Total	100	30
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	33

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - SFEC - 3: 84.310A

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: The Ohio State University (U310A180049)

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:

.

Weaknesses:

.

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:

.

Weaknesses:

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:

Weaknesses:

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:

Table 2 on page e34 provides 4 performance measures closely aligned with the project activities, including very specific target figures for each year of the project, allowing close monitoring of implementation activities. The evaluation plan (pgs e50-e51) provides a very detailed, thorough description of the goals of the evaluation, and the process through which implementation and outcomes will be closely monitored and reported. Table 7 provides not only data sources with a detailed timeline, but also delineates how each data source closely aligns with the evaluation purposes. There is a good balance between qualitative data collected from site visits and interviews along with quantitative data from administrative records and surveys. The composite implementation variable described on page e55 provides a solid foundation on which to base the evaluation of implementation fidelity and the influence of contextual factors.

The evaluation specifies formative evaluation questions, along with very detailed information about how those formative (e.g. process) questions will be answered, including details on the frequency of data collection (Table 9, page e54) that

should allow for mid-course adjustments based on a feedback loop between evaluators and project staff. The evaluator states an intent to provide detailed feedback at least annually, via evaluation reports as well as “periodic briefings”. (page e57)

The applicant describes a quasi-experimental study (pgs e57-e59) that includes both between groups (treatment and control groups) and within groups (high and low implementing groups) analyses, which will allow for a comprehensive analysis of promising evidence about program effectiveness.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted

Reader's Score: 30

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:

Sheldon (2007) cited by the applicant is a well-designed quasi-experimental study including both treatment and matched control schools. The comparison schools were matched based on prior achievement, enrollment size and average daily attendance, ethnic composition and Title I status. This study found a statistically significant positive finding on student attendance, and “being a member of the National Network of Partnership Schools had a small-to-medium effect on daily student attendance.” (p.272) Applicant states one major activity of this project will be training staff to “support the deployment of the National Network of Partnership Schools Model (NNPS Model)” (p.e24) and provides thorough details about what this model involves. The study cited by Sheldon examines school membership in the same network.

The citation found a favorable effect on student attendance. On page e51, Table 7, the applicant demonstrates their intent to annually measure student attendance as a relevant outcome to the project.

Weaknesses:

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:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/22/2018 01:07 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/22/2018 12:02 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: The Ohio State University (U310A180049)

Reader #2: *****

	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	18
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Resources	20	20
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	30	0
Sub Total	100	66
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	68

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - SFEC - 3: 84.310A

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: The Ohio State University (U310A180049)

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 logic model provided on page 3 demonstrates a clear framework for the proposed project and outlines specific activities that are aligned with outputs and both short and long-term outcomes for the project.

The long-term outcomes specified in the framework and logic model on page 3 indicate that the project will have effects that last beyond the scope of the grant. For example, the applicant indicates that the Ohio state frameworks, policies, and supports for LEAs around family engagement will be improved. This type of long-term outcome will likely result in capacity that is designed to extend beyond the grant period.

The applicant indicates that the model to be utilized in the project is based on Epstein's theory of overlapping spheres of influence (pp. 4-5). This theory is sound, based on research and has been applied in numerous other projects and studies. It provides a solid framework for the project and has been rigorously researched and applied in the field of family engagement.

The applicant provides strong and sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the project activities and model to be used to implement the project are based on current knowledge from both research and practice (p. 10).

No additional strengths.

Weaknesses:

The applicant indicates that it will utilize a train the trainers model to ensure capacity beyond the project period (p. 11) but does not indicate how it will ensure that those who have been trained have sufficient understanding to be able to yield results beyond the project implementation period.

No additional weaknesses.

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:

The applicant indicates that part of the project will be to convene a State Advisory Committee (p. 4, 16) which will include the families and local community members in the project. This group will be an active partner in the development of the proposed project and framework and will guide the development of resources and tools for the proposed project. This committee is an adequate way to ensure that a diversity of perspectives is included in the operation of the project.

The applicant indicates a long and active history with providing project services of the type proposed in the grant as well as a set of three primary partners who will work together to effectively implement the grant activities (p. 17-18). Each partner has a specific set of activities that the partner will be responsible for and each was chosen for a specific set of expertise. Based on these partners, the project will be implemented effectively in collaboration with each other.

The key project personnel outlined on pages 19-20 have relevant training and experience to effectively manage and implement the grant activities. In particular, Joyce Epstein is a leader in parent engagement research and Barbara Boone, the PI has a long history of effective work in parent engagement and parent capacity building.

The management plan clearly outlines the objectives and activities to be carried out over the course of the grant period as well as the individuals responsible for accomplishing those tasks (pp. 22-25). This plan is likely to result in the proposed project being accomplished on time and within budget and clearly specifies the responsibilities of all those involved.

The applicant indicates that the PI will be on the grant for 40% FTE and the co-PI for 30% FTE during all five years of the grant. In addition, there will be two 100% FTE individuals who are running the grant (pp. e104-e164). This level of time commitment from key personnel indicates that the project will likely be implemented successfully and with very good resources available from these key individuals.

No additional strengths.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not specify how recruiting for the advisory committee will be conducted to ensure that there are a diverse set of parents, community members and others included in the membership (p. 16).

The management plan does not include specific milestones (pp. 22-25) to address key points of the proposed project. Milestones would be helpful to ensure grant goals are met.

No additional weaknesses.

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 applicant clearly outlines the key contributions and activities that each partner will be responsible for (pp. 25). In addition the preliminary memorandums of understanding between each of the key partners demonstrates the level of commitment of each partner to ensure the successful implementation and success of the project (pp. e62-e70).

Given the scope of the project and the objectives and activities that are proposed, the costs of the project proposed in the budget are reasonable (pp. 26-27). The amount proposed in the budget is sufficient to allow for the completion of the proposed activities successfully while at the same time, maximizing resources and ensuring that the budget is used effectively to complete the proposed objectives.

The applicant indicates that this project will reach at minimum, 10,000 families across the state of Ohio, which is approximately 10% of the state's districts. Moreover, the applicant indicates that an even better estimate is that they will reach 54,656 students and their families by the fifth year of the grant (p. 29). Given the costs of administering the grant, this is reasonable given the large number of children and their families who will be able to participate and be served by this project.

No additional strengths.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted

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 proposes the development of a series of 2-3 new resources for families and educational personnel on a variety of topics related to educational choices, family-school communication, early literacy development and family financial literacy (pp. 14-15). Such resources are a valuable tool for families to utilize and help support their child's educational attainment and development.

No additional strengths.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not provide a clear indication of how the information will be disseminated to families or how the applicant will ensure that families receive the information in a way that they will be able to apply it (pp. 15).

No additional weaknesses.

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/22/2018 12:02 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/22/2018 12:53 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: The Ohio State University (U310A180049)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	24
Quality of Management Plan/Project Personnel		
1. Management/Personel	20	18
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Resources	20	20
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	30	0
Sub Total	100	62
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	63

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - SFEC - 3: 84.310A

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: The Ohio State University (U310A180049)

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:

Criterion 1: The applicant provides a coherent conceptual framework and a detailed logic model. The conceptual framework includes state-level training and technical assistance and direct services for families. The conceptual framework is based on the Dual Capacity-Building Framework created by the US Department of Education. (P. e22). The logic model includes activities along with specific outputs and outcomes. The logic model identifies the number of families to be served. (P. e23).

Criterion 2: The services to be provided are supported with research. The applicant plans to implement a nested approach to the National Network of Partnership Schools Model. Clearly identifying the roles of different stakeholders in the implementation of the project is an effective practice that is likely to support effective implementation of the project. (P. e27).

Criterion 3: The applicant plans to develop resources for statewide dissemination during each year of the grant. The applicant will provide training for regional and school level teams. This is likely to build the capacity of the schools being served.

Weaknesses:

Criterion 1: None

Criterion 2: None

Criterion 3: The applicant does not detail the structures and resources that will extend beyond the term of the grant at the state level. (P. e21).

Reader's Score: 24

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:

Criterion 1: The applicant plans to develop a State Advisory Committee that will include parents, students, educators, and members of key organizations. (P. e36). The diversity of the State Advisory Committee will help to ensure that a diversity of perspectives are considered.

Criterion 2: The proposed project involves the collaboration of multiple partners that will play a role in maximizing the effectiveness of the services. The project partners include the National Association of Family, School, and Community Engagement as well as the National Network of Partnership Schools. (P. e38).

Criterion 3: The applicant provides a detailed management plan with activities, objectives, assigned personnel, major tasks and timelines. The management plan includes activities throughout the term of the grant. (P. e42 – e44). In addition the management plan includes specific information about the number of schools and teachers to be served.

Criterion 4: They key project personnel possess a variety of expertise and experience including supporting family engagement programs. (P. e40 – e41).

Weaknesses:

Criterion 1: None

Criterion 2: None

Criterion 3: The management plan does not include specific milestones or accomplishments for each year of the grant. (P. e42 – e44).

Criterion 4: None

Reader's Score: 18

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:

Criterion 1: The proposed project partners are relevant. The applicant provides specific information about the commitments and contributions of each of the project partners. The applicant provides MOUs for each partner. (P. e45).

Criterion 2: The costs of the project appear to be reasonable and justified based on the scope and objectives of the proposed project. The annual costs are closely aligned to the objectives for each year of the project. (P. e46 – e48).

Criterion 3: The applicant provides detailed information about the number of schools, and teachers to be served by the

project. Based on the number of individuals to be served and families to be impacted, the costs of the project are reasonable. (P. e48 – e49).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

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 plans to provide information and tools to support educational choice through a resource website.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not detail the specific resources that will be provided or indicate that ways in which they will ensure the families access these resources.

Reader's Score: 1

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/22/2018 12:53 PM