

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/22/2018 03:47 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** National Center for Families Learning (U310A180061)

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

|   | Points Possible | Points Scored |
|---|-----------------|---------------|
| <b>Questions</b>                                    |                 |               |
| <b>Selection Criteria</b>                           |                 |               |
| <b>Quality of Project Design</b>                    |                 |               |
| 1. Project Design                                   | 30              | 30            |
| <b>Quality of Management Plan/Project Personnel</b> |                 |               |
| 1. Management/Personel                              | 20              | 15            |
| <b>Adequacy of Resources</b>                        |                 |               |
| 1. Resources  | 20              | 15            |
| <b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>            |                 |               |
| 1. Project Evaluation                               | 30              | 0             |
| <b>Sub Total</b>                                    | 100             | 60            |
| <b>Priority Questions</b>                           |                 |               |
| <b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>            |                 |               |
| <b>Competitive Preference Priority 1a or 1b</b>     |                 |               |
| 1. CPP 1(a) or CPP 1(b)                             | 3               | 0             |
| <b>Sub Total</b>                                    | 3               | 0             |
| <b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>            |                 |               |
| <b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>            |                 |               |
| 1. CPP 2  | 3               | 3             |
| <b>Sub Total</b>                                    | 3               | 3             |
| <b>Total</b>  | 106             | 63            |

# Technical Review Form

Panel #6 - SFEC - 6: 84.310A

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

Applicant: National Center for Families Learning (U310A180061)

## 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 proposes a three-tiered evidence-based approach to family engagement and family literacy. The intervention are based on equity, effective practice and research that coincide with the intensity and duration of services to promote educational equity, addressing family goals, culturally responsive changing needs of families and taking asset-based approach to supporting families. For example, the applicant proposes to address family engagement by adopting the ED Dual Capacity Framework (Kuttner & Mapp, 2013) that focuses on improving academic achievement for students from diverse cultural backgrounds. (pgs 4-5)

2-The applicant has cited current research that will be used to develop the initiatives for the proposed project. For example, the applicant proposes strategies on training LEA staff on how to implement the family literacy model. This model is based on evaluation outcomes and practices by developing the Dialogic Reading. (pg 9)

3-The applicant proposes to provide a comprehensive statewide training system for the key stakeholders that is tied to school improvement plans and statewide education goals. Also, the applicant will activate a digital family and engagement resource system that will be available on the local and statewide systems. (pg 13)

### Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted

Reader's Score: 30

### 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 the diversity of perspectives in the operation of the proposed project. For example, the applicant proposes to manage the cross-sector partner collaborations through reviewing and integrating state and local policies, existing family engagement initiatives and state academic standards and parent needs. Another strategy is to digitize the statewide parent-to-parent network and establishing the parent training and information centers for disability participants. (pg 17)

2-The applicant proposes to form a Special Advisory Committee that will consist of a diverse membership (from the educational community, community agencies, business community and parents) Some of the partners include The Nebraska Children and Families Foundation offers resources that address child safety and understanding protective factors and The Nebraska Department of Education (NDE) will be serving as the lead partner in the development and sustainability of the project. (pgs 28-29)

3-The applicant has provided a comprehensive management that shows the alignment of the goals, activities, person responsible, timeline and milestones. For example, in goal 3-empower parents of disadvantage students with the information and tools to make good choices for their child's education. In year one the applicant will create a digital resource system that address school choice. (pgs 21-23)

4- The applicant has given a description of the key personnel for the proposed project. For example, the applicant provides an organizational chart that shows the key personnel positions that will be needed to operate the proposed project. (pg 18 and appendices 5 and 6)

**Weaknesses:**

1-The applicant lacked the insufficient supporting information to show that the disciplinary and professional experts are aligned with the goals and objective of the proposed project. (Pg 17)

4-The applicant lacked the details that would describe the job descriptions, duties and responsibilities of the key personnel. (pg 18)

**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 has provided supporting documentation to show the partner commitment (MOUs). The applicant has also indicated that it has an established history (three decades) in building on the collaboration network of partners. These partnerships are at the local, state and national levels. (pgs 27)

2-The applicant provided a budget breakdown that showed the justification on why the cost (direct and indirect) of the proposed project is reasonable and adequate to meet the need of the participants. (pgs (e172-e173)

3-The applicant provides a cost analysis that is reasonable as it relates to the services that will be provided for the participants. (pg e175)

**Weaknesses:**

2-The applicant lacks the detailed supporting information to show the if the cost is reasonable as it relates to the project design such as limited information about the committed partners and their in kind contributions. (pg e172)

3-The applicant lacks the reported information that will show if the projected expenses are reasonable because there is no data on the number of students it will serve nor the per pupil cost. (pg e175)

**Reader's Score: 15**

**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 indicates that it will implement a systematic, high impact statewide infrastructure of family engagement that improves student development and raises academic achievement. The initiative will also foster family literacy and promote positive educational choices for disadvantaged families through evidence-based family literacy strategies, family engagement and parent education. (pg 3)

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 3**

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 08/22/2018 03:47 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/22/2018 04:13 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** National Center for Families Learning (U310A180061)

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

|   | Points Possible | Points Scored |
|---|-----------------|---------------|
| <b>Questions</b>                                    |                 |               |
| <b>Selection Criteria</b>                           |                 |               |
| <b>Quality of Project Design</b>                    |                 |               |
| 1. Project Design                                   | 30              | 30            |
| <b>Quality of Management Plan/Project Personnel</b> |                 |               |
| 1. Management/Personel                              | 20              | 15            |
| <b>Adequacy of Resources</b>                        |                 |               |
| 1. Resources  | 20              | 15            |
| <b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>            |                 |               |
| 1. Project Evaluation                               | 30              | 0             |
| <b>Sub Total</b>                                    | 100             | 60            |
| <b>Priority Questions</b>                           |                 |               |
| <b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>            |                 |               |
| <b>Competitive Preference Priority 1a or 1b</b>     |                 |               |
| 1. CPP 1(a) or CPP 1(b)                             | 3               | 0             |
| <b>Sub Total</b>                                    | 3               | 0             |
| <b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>            |                 |               |
| <b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>            |                 |               |
| 1. CPP 2  | 3               | 3             |
| <b>Sub Total</b>                                    | 3               | 3             |
| <b>Total</b>  | 106             | 63            |

# Technical Review Form

Panel #6 - SFEC - 6: 84.310A

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

Applicant: National Center for Families Learning (U310A180061)

## 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 provides a clear conceptual framework with an evidence-based approach to family engagement and family literacy. This three-tiered intervention is driven by research and based on equity, effective practice, and research. It consists of the intense and long-term services needed to promote educational equity. It is also driven by the families' goals as well as being culturally responsive to the varying needs of disadvantaged families and takes an asset-based approach to support families. (Pages 3-5)
2. The applicant clearly describes the project including current knowledge from research and effective practices that are evidence-based. For example, it includes research showing that parent involvement helps to improve academic achievement for students from diverse cultural backgrounds. The ED Dual Capacity Framework is essential for high impact family engagement that provides trust between families and schools which constructs the foundation for a strong partnership according to Kuttner & Mapp's 2013 study. (Pages 4-6)
3. The applicant describes a well-defined project that is designed to build capacity and yield results and can be extended beyond the period of the grant. For example, the three-tiered framework builds the capacity of all involved participants to increase student achievement and school improvement through family engagement. The intervention creates a robust collaboration between parents, students, educators, and communities which allow for the ability to learn together and share knowledge, resulting in a powerful collective of families engaged in education. (Pages 4-7)

### Weaknesses:

1. None
2. None
3. None

### 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 ensures that a diversity of perspectives is brought to bear when it comes to the operation of the proposed project. The organization states that these varied perspectives will contribute to the SFEC project through the management of cross-sector partner collaboration. This entails reviewing and integrating state and local policies, existing family engagement initiatives, state academic standards, and identified parent needs. All these factors will determine how to best embed the SFEC project into the state system. The agency included written, signed, and dated Memorandums of Understanding (MOUs) for Nebraska Children and Families Foundation and Nebraska Department of Education along with LEAs and their roles and responsibilities, which are appropriate for the SFEC project. (Pages 17 and 18)

2. The services provided by the SFEC project involve the collaborations of appropriate partners. This reflects the significant input from partners including their expertise and vast knowledge of the Nebraska education system which will create the infrastructure necessary to meet the needs of the state's families. The applicant provided an organizational chart and a visual representation of the statewide infrastructure appropriate for maximizing the effectiveness of the SFEC project services. (Page 18, Appendix)

3. The applicant describes a 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. For example, the organization describes each goal for the SFEC project with appropriate SFEC required elements that will implement the SFEC project in a timely manner. The start date was identified as November 1, 2018. (Pages 19-26)

4. The applicant describes the qualification and experience of key project personnel for the SFEC project. For example, the combination of personnel identified represent over 74 years of experience towards supporting the SFEC project. The organization identified their key personnel such as the SFEC Project Director. The agency provides an appropriate resume demonstrating their qualifications and experiences as required. In addition, the organization describes each personnel's role and responsibilities as it relates to the timely implementation of the project activities. (Pages 26, Appendix)

#### Weaknesses:

1. The applicant does not provide a discussion on how the agency will ensure the diversity of perspectives from variety of disciplinary and professional fields.
2. None
3. None
4. The applicant does not provide a clear discussion on the training plan for the SFEC project. There are no job descriptions for the Grant Coordinator, Budget Analyst, and NCFL Administrative Assistant. It is difficult to assess if these positions will be qualified to implement the activities in the SFEC project in a timely manner. (Page 18, Appendix)

**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 commitment of each partner to successfully implement the SFEC project. This is shown through the supplied written, signed, and dated MOUs for all of their partners. The MOUs consist of objectives and strategies, financial commitments, programmatic commitments and the long-term commitments, which adequately support the SFEC activities. In addition, the organization's partners consist of the Lexington Public Schools; the Nebraska Children and Families Foundation, the Lincoln Public Schools, Unite for Literacy, and the Nebraska Department of Education.
2. The applicant explains that the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project. For example, the applicant provides a line-item budget and budget narrative for the federal and nonfederal share of SFEC project costs. The organization is requesting \$4,577,807 in federal funds and providing \$619,395 for the non-federal match. Specifically, the organization allocated costs for 20 annual trips by various NCFL staff members and evaluation contractor to Nebraska partner locations for grant activities including training and technical assistance, statewide conferences to share SFEC findings and best practices, and evaluation services. Visits are estimated at \$1,500 each including: round-trip airfare and associated fees (\$500), lodging (\$250/night x 3 nights), per diem (\$50/day x 3 days), and ground transportation (\$100). (Pages 30 and 31, Appendix)
3. The applicant describes reasonable costs in relation to the number of persons to be served and the anticipated results and benefits. For example, the family engagement strategies, professional development, and direct services to families represent a multi-pronged approach which will reach tens of thousands of families with students of varying ages. In addition, the budget fulfills funding requirements to spend not less than 65% each fiscal year to serve LEAs, schools, and community-based organizations that serve high concentrations of disadvantaged students. They also show that no less than 30% of the funds will be used to establish or expand technical assistance for evidence-based parent education programs. Specifically, the organization will leverage hundreds of organizational networks through these partners which in

turn will disseminate and promote SFEC resources. (Page 31)

**Weaknesses:**

1. None
2. The applicant does not provide in-kind services for the SFEC project.
3. The applicant does not provide a clear narrative on the number of participants.

**Reader's Score: 15**

**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 designs a model that will provide families with the information and tools they need to make important decisions regarding the educational choice that is most appropriate for their children. For example, the organization will create a robust collaboration of families, schools, and communities across Nebraska that will promote collaborative learning. This sharing of knowledge can result in a powerful collective of families actively engaging in education. Additionally, the outcomes will include effective family-school partnerships; increased student attendance, academic success, and the ability of LEAs to provide optimal learning environments to support families' goals. (Pages 3, 7)

**Weaknesses:**

None

**Reader's Score: 3**

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 08/22/2018 04:13 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/21/2018 11:59 AM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** National Center for Families Learning (U310A180061)

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

|   | Points Possible | Points Scored |
|---|-----------------|---------------|
| <b>Questions</b>                                    |                 |               |
| <b>Selection Criteria</b>                           |                 |               |
| <b>Quality of Project Design</b>                    |                 |               |
| 1. Project Design                                   | 30              | 0             |
| <b>Quality of Management Plan/Project Personnel</b> |                 |               |
| 1. Management/Personel                              | 20              | 0             |
| <b>Adequacy of Resources</b>                        |                 |               |
| 1. Resources  | 20              | 0             |
| <b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>            |                 |               |
| 1. Project Evaluation                               | 30              | 23            |
| <b>Sub Total</b>                                    | 100             | 23            |
| <b>Priority Questions</b>                           |                 |               |
| <b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>            |                 |               |
| <b>Competitive Preference Priority 1a or 1b</b>     |                 |               |
| 1. CPP 1(a) or CPP 1(b)                             | 3               | 3             |
| <b>Sub Total</b>                                    | 3               | 3             |
| <b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>            |                 |               |
| <b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>            |                 |               |
| 1. CPP 2  | 3               | 0             |
| <b>Sub Total</b>                                    | 3               | 0             |
| <b>Total</b>  | 106             | 26            |

# Technical Review Form

Panel #6 - SFEC - 6: 84.310A

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

Applicant: National Center for Families Learning (U310A180061)

## 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 evaluation plan was very clear and thorough. The application proposes to use objective performance measures that are well-aligned to the intended outcomes of the project to evaluate each goal and objective (pp. 33-41). The evaluation plan, if carried out as intended, will provide a robust dataset of quantitative and qualitative data.
- (2) The application includes a well-defined timeline for evaluation activities and proposes monthly meetings with project staff to share findings (pp. 19-25, 35-41). The evaluation plan also contains a strategy for assessing fidelity of implementation. The evaluation plan, if executed well, will provide leadership with the information needed to assess progress in a timely manner (pp. 42-43).
- (3) The application proposes to utilize a quasi-experimental design (QED) to evaluate the impact of the family literacy program on student outcomes (p. 42).

**Weaknesses:**

- (1) No weaknesses noted.
- (2) No weaknesses noted.
- (3) The plan for the QED impact study of the family literacy program on student reading and school outcomes may not be sufficient to produce evidence of promise because the analyses as described do not include statistical controls for selection bias (p. 42). The application would be strengthened by including covariates to control for differences between the intervention and comparison groups. Although the applicant conducted a power analysis to determine the sample size for the QED, the applicant failed to describe from where the sample would be drawn (pp. 41-42).

**Reader's Score: 23**

**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:**

The application meets criteria for Competitive Preference Priority 1b. The application provided a citation of a practice guide that found a moderate to strong evidence base for reading strategies proposed to be incorporated into the family literacy programming. The application also reported on findings from a quasi-experimental design study on the current family literacy model that found a positive, significant effect of the program on participating children's reading growth rates (p. 15).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses 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:** 08/21/2018 11:59 AM