

**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: EdVenture Group, Inc. (U310A180062)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	30
Quality of Management Plan/Project Personnel		
1. Management/Personel	20	15
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Resources	20	15
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	3
Sub Total	3	3
Total	106	63

Technical Review Form

Panel #6 - SFEC - 6: 84.310A

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: EdVenture Group, Inc. (U310A180062)

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 has cited conceptual frameworks that will address inclusion, family engagement and diversity in the proposed project. One example is the Family and Community Engagement Resource Center (FCERC/PERC) which has a robust model for family engagement. (pg 10)

2-On pages 24-25 the applicant has indicated that the proposed project will be grounded in current research and effective practices. For example, the applicant indicates that the Dual Capacity Building Framework for Family-School Partnerships will lead to improved student outcomes at the school level as well as increase family engagement, academic achievement, and graduation rates. It will also supply effective indicators for tracking attendance, behavior and academic progress.

3-The applicant will utilize three frameworks that will be used to develop strategies for addressing capacity building. The Standards for High Quality Schools is a school improvement process based on the research of Project Assist. This-model has produced improved results in Title I, Part A, 1003 (g) School Improvement Grant (SIG) schools and the ESEA Flexibility Priority Schools. The model will be adapted to reflect the US Department of Education Cycle of Continuous Improvement which supports capacity building and the Dual-Capacity Building Framework. The applicant demonstrates that it will continuously improve strategies with an understanding to using relevant, evidence-based interventions that will remove barriers. This will lead to promoting services and products locally and nationally. (pps 12 and 21)

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

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 indicated that the services from the professional and business community will ensure that the diversity of perspectives is continuously embedded in the daily operations of the project. For example, the applicant proposes to administer a school climate survey and a parental engagement survey to monitor the activities. (pps 17-18)

2-The applicant has established state and local partnerships that have provided supporting documentation to show the commitment and contributions that will be made to the proposed project. For example, the applicant has commitments from Parent Engagement Family Resource Center, State Pre-K Steering Team, West Virginia Parent Association and the Grandfamilies Project Of West Virginia State University. (pg 20)

3-The applicant has provided a management timeline that included measurable objectives and evidence-based outcomes. For example, the applicant proposes to identify and recruit 20 Comprehensive schools based on statewide performance measures. (pp. 22-23)

4-The applicant provided the qualifications for the key personnel who will plan and implement the activities. For example, the Executive Director has nearly 11 years of experience as a school psychologist and 3 and half years of experience as a coordinator in the Office of Special Programs in the state Education Office. (pg e62)

Weaknesses:

2-The applicant lack supporting documentation (MOUs) to show that the partners are committed to the proposed project. (pg 20)

3-The applicant lacked the details to determine who will implement the activities and identifying the milestones. The applicant lacked the activities to show the time line and the implementation process for the activity. (pg 22)

4-The applicant lacked the details that would describe the job descriptions, duties and responsibilities of the key personnel. The applicant proposes to hire a Lead Coordinator, Executive Director and a Coordinator for special programs. (pg e62)

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 provided the names of the local and state agencies that will be involved in the proposed project. The applicant also described the contributions that the partners will make to the project. (pps 25-26)

2-The applicant provided a summary of the direct and indirect cost of the program as well as the agencies that will provide in kind services. (pgs e139-e142)

3-The applicant indicated that it will continue to add Comprehensive Schools yearly that meet the criteria. (pg 11)

Weaknesses:

2-The applicant lacked the information to show that the proposed project design is reasonable and is aligned with the objectives of the project. (pg e139)

3-The applicant lacked the information to clearly show the number of students who will receive services and if these services are adequate and the cost is reasonable. (pg 11)

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 indicated it will implement decision making strategies and support tools that will aid the targeted families with appropriate educational choice. On pg 13 the applicant proposed to create a high-impact family, school and community engagement center that will provide families with the information and tools they need to make decisions regarding educational choice.

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 04:16 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: EdVenture Group, Inc. (U310A180062)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	30
Quality of Management Plan/Project Personnel		
1. Management/Personel	20	15
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Resources	20	15
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	3
Sub Total	3	3
Total	106	63

Technical Review Form

Panel #6 - SFEC - 6: 84.310A

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: EdVenture Group, Inc. (U310A180062)

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 (the Dual-Capacity Building) for family-school partnerships in the SFEC initiative. The applicant demonstrates this using research-based evidence which shows that parents, family, and community involvement in education correlates with higher academic performance, student well-being, and school improvement. They also included recent studies stating that positive family engagement consists of staying involved in student's education, focusing on student's individual strengths, and having and expressing high expectations of academic achievement throughout a student's education. (Pages 2-22)

2. The applicant clearly explains a well-defined model that reflects current knowledge from research and effective practices for the SFEC project. For example, the organization lists several research studies that proved the needs for family-school partnerships in West Virginia Schools. They are the West Virginia Expanded School Mental Health Family Engagement Toolkit (2017), the Expanded School Mental Health Department of West Virginia (2017) and the West Virginia Department of Education Resource Hub for Families, 2018. (Pages 2-10)

3. The applicant describes a well-defined project that is designed to build capacity and yield results that can be extended beyond the period of the grant. For example, the agency provides their capacity building initiatives which would engage families, SEAs, LEAs, school-level staff and personnel, and community-based organizations. The focus point of this capacity building initiative would be to build the intellectual, social, and human capital of stakeholder's engagement within the SFEC program. (Pages 8 and 9)

Weaknesses:

1. None

2. None

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 describes how the SFEC will ensure a diversity of perspectives is brought to bear in the operation. For example, the organization will create an advisory committee established by a varied group of stakeholders, families, and partnering organizations. The composition of families on the advisory council will represent the diversity of the families served. (Pages 21, 28)

2. The applicant explains clearly the services that will be provided involving the collaboration of appropriate partners (letters of support were included) for maximizing the effectiveness of SFEC services. For example, the organization will support family participation in various school or community opportunities, account for cultural and individual differences, enable participation for all who want to contribute regardless of skill level and provide support to improve participation skills. There are strategies for cultivating family involvement such as scheduled meetings which accommodate parent schedules, transportation, and other family needs. They also will provide staff development on welcoming and working collaboratively with families and students as well as referrals for community resources. (Pages 28 and 29, Appendix)

3. The applicant describes a partial management plan in order to achieve the objectives of the proposed project. For example, this plan includes the project activities by year and milestones for accomplishing these tasks. In addition, in Year 1, the organization will identify and recruit 20 Comprehensive Schools based on statewide performance measures that will participate in the West Virginia Family Engagement Center initiative. (Pages 16-19)

4. The applicant partially describes qualifications, including experience of key personnel. For example, the organization included resumes that describe the qualifications, experience and professional development of key personnel. The budget identified the President & CEO of the EdVenture Group, who has a commitment of 520 hours towards the SFEC project including working with WVDE, LEA's and other partners to direct, develop, manage, guide, report, and organize all aspects of the project. (Appendix)

Weaknesses:

1. None
2. None
3. The applicant does not provide a clear discussion in their management plan that identifies the start and end dates of activities, the responsibilities, and timeline to implement the SFEC initiative in a timely manner and within budget.
4. The applicant does not provide an organizational chart to identify the positions or persons supporting the SFEC project.

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 provides letters of support from partners demonstrating their commitment to the SFEC project. For example, the Bureau of Juvenile Services will support student achievement, school improvement, and increase the number of high-quality educational options available to families in West Virginia schools. This includes serving low-income families, parents of English learners, minorities, the student with disabilities, homeless children and youth, and students in foster care. (Appendix)
2. The applicant explains the costs in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the SFEC project. For example, the line-item budget and budget narrative for the federal (\$4,983,181) and non-federal share (\$753,300) of project costs seem reasonable as it relates to the project objectives and design. In addition, each line item details its cost calculations.
3. The applicant describes the costs in relation to the number of persons to be served and the anticipated results and benefits. For example, the organization has identified and will recruit 20 Comprehensive Schools with a total number of participating schools increasing by twenty each year. (Page 24, Appendix)

Weaknesses:

1. The applicant does not include Memorandums of Understandings (MOUs) that show a strong commitment to the SFEC

project.

2. The budget does not provide a clear explanation of travel expenses for the SFEC project. For example, the one-day trips to Charleston for 3 people do not state what the trips are for such as a training, conference, or meeting.

3. The applicant does not provide information identifying the number of public per cost aligned with the number of students they will serve.

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 explains that within the implementation of the WVFEC initiative, there is a direct correlation between increased family engagement within the school setting and improved performance within both literacy and numeracy among high need, low performing students. For example, the effective action steps towards improving student performance in both mathematics and reading covered linking family and community engagement efforts to student learning, creating initiatives that will support families in guiding their child's learning, developing the capacity of school staff to work with families, focusing efforts to engage families on developing trusting and respectful relationships and embracing a philosophy of partnership and willingness to share power with families. (Page 30 and 31)

Weaknesses:

None

Reader's Score: 3

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/22/2018 04:16 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/21/2018 12:00 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: EdVenture Group, Inc. (U310A180062)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	0
Quality of Management Plan/Project Personnel		
1. Management/Personel	20	0
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Resources	20	0
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	30	26
Sub Total	100	26
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	0
Sub Total	3	0
Total	106	26

Technical Review Form

Panel #6 - SFEC - 6: 84.310A

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: EdVenture Group, Inc. (U310A180062)

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 application proposes a robust evaluation plan that, if carried out well, will produce quantitative and qualitative data that can be used to evaluate the impact of the project on student outcomes. Project objectives (pp. 22-24, e60-1) are clear and measurable. The evaluation plan is comprehensive and well-designed for assessing achievement of project objectives (pp. 31-37). The intended outcomes of the project are well defined and the evaluation questions and methodology are well aligned (pp. 31-37).
- (2) Execution of the evaluation plan will provide regular and sufficient performance feedback to project leadership. The evaluation plan specifically addresses how leadership will assess adherence to project deadlines, fidelity of implementation of program components, and project activity participation rates (pp. 31-40). This data will be discussed monthly with project leadership (p. 39). An annual cumulative report will also be shared with project staff and stakeholders (pp. 39-40). A particular strength of the application in terms of progress monitoring is the ability of key project members to log into a dashboard to view a real-time summary of capacity and process data (pp. 36-37).

(3) If well implemented, the evaluation methods will produce promising evidence of the overall project's effectiveness on improving student outcomes. The application proposes to employ a longitudinal cluster-randomized controlled trial to evaluate the impact of the project on student outcomes (pp. 33, 37-39). The evaluation plan will yield information about the impact of the program on student outcomes when implemented for multiple years. Because change takes time, the longitudinal design is a strength of the application. The analysis plan takes into account the nested nature of the design and is appropriate over time.

Weaknesses:

(1) Measureable objectives under Goal 2 (p.23) are focused on family reports of improved attitudes, enhanced engagement, and increased decision-making capacity; however, the application does not describe how those objectives will be measured. No efforts to collect data from families are discussed in the evaluation plan. Generally, the exclusion of family data from the evaluation plan is a weakness of the application.

(2) No weaknesses noted.

(3) One threat to achieving the highest WWC design standards rating is school-level attrition. At the beginning of project year 1, 100 schools will be randomly assigned to treatment or control conditions (pp. 33-34). There is a concern that schools in the control condition will drop out of the study at a differential rate than treatment schools given the length of time they may have to wait to participate in the program. It is also not clear what would happen if a control school who met the criteria for a comprehensive school in Year 1 no longer met the criteria in a subsequent year prior to implementation of the program.

Reader's Score: 26

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 did not address Competitive Preference Priority 1.

Weaknesses:

The application did not address Competitive Preference Priority 1.

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:

n/a

Weaknesses:

n/a

Reader's Score: **0**

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/21/2018 12:00 PM