

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 11/01/2018 06:52 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Mid-Atlantic Equity Consortium, Inc. (U310A180044)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	30	25
<b>Quality of Management Plan/Project Personnel</b>		
1. Management/Personel	20	10
<b>Adequacy of Resources</b>		
1. Resources	20	20
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	30	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	55
<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	1
<b>Sub Total</b>	3	1
<b>Total</b>	106	56

# Technical Review Form

Panel #7 - SFEC - 7 - 1: 84.310A

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

Applicant: Mid-Atlantic Equity Consortium, Inc. (U310A180044)

## 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 logic model that includes key inputs, outputs and short, moderate and long-term outcomes. The applicant also describes the project's conceptual framework which includes four research-based components. (P. e23 – e24). The three-tiered model of support is clear and research-based.

Criterion 2: The applicant provides detailed research to support the components of the proposed project including the proposed activities of different project partners. (P. e25 – e27).

Criterion 3: The proposed project includes the development of parent engagement policies and resources that will extend beyond the term of the grant. In addition, individuals at the local, LEA and SEA levels will receive extensive training that is likely to build capacity beyond the term of the grant. (P. e28).

### Weaknesses:

Criterion 1: The conceptual framework provides four key parts. However, it is unclear how the aspects of the conceptual framework are connected to the parts of the project. The applicant does not clearly indicate how the conceptual framework impacts the design of the project. (P. e23 – e24).

Reader's Score: 25

### Selection Criteria - Quality of Management Plan/Project Personnel

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the services to be provided by the proposed project. In determining the quality of project personnel, the Secretary considers the extent to which the applicant encourages applications for employment from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability. In addition, in determining the quality of the management plan and project personnel, the Secretary considers—
  - (1) How the applicant will ensure that a diversity of perspectives are brought to bear in the operation of the proposed project, including those of parents, teachers, the business community, a variety of disciplinary and professional fields, recipients or beneficiaries of services, or others, as appropriate.
  - (2) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project involve the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project services.
  - (3) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and

**within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.**

**(4) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel.**

**Strengths:**

Criterion 1: None noted.

Criterion 2: The project includes proposed project partners who will collaborate to provide a variety of activities for the grant. The partners are appropriate and have strong experience with supporting family engagement. (P. e40 – e41).

Criterion 3: None noted.

Criterion 4: The applicant identifies the key project personnel and provides resumes and curriculum vitae for each project staff member. The key project personnel possess significant experience and expertise in family engagement, school leadership, and statewide policymaking and advocacy. (P. e44 – e46)

**Weaknesses:**

Criterion 1: Although the applicant identifies groups that will be included in the advisory committees, the applicant does not specifically identify how the applicant will ensure that diverse perspectives are included. The applicant does not provide specific information about how the various stakeholders will be engaged and the extent to which stakeholder input will impact the development of the project. (P. e39 – e40).

Criterion 3: The management plan does not clearly indicate the persons responsible for each of the activities or milestones. In addition, the applicant does not provide a detailed timeline for the key milestones. Instead the applicant identifies the year in which the milestone will be accomplished.

**Reader's Score: 10**

**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: There is a clear statement of support and commitment from each of the proposed project partners. The project partners are relevant to the proposed grant because of their experience and expertise with parent and family engagement at the school, community and state levels. (P. e45 – e46).

Criterion 2: The costs of the proposed project are reasonable given the scope and potential significance of the grant. The applicant clearly outlines the objectives of the project. (P. e47 – e50).

Criterion 3: The applicant clearly details the anticipated number of parents, educators and other stakeholders who will be served by the project. The number of persons to be served by the project will be enhanced by the development of a website to support networking, training, and access to resources. The costs of the proposed project are very reasonable in relation to the number of persons who are expected to be served during the term of the project. (P. e51 – e53).

**Weaknesses:**

None 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:**

Not evaluated.

**Weaknesses:**

Not evaluated.

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Priority Questions**

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

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

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

**Strengths:**

Not evaluated.

**Weaknesses:**

Not evaluated.

**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 families with information about opportunities for dual enrollment, AP courses, early childhood options, gifted and talented programs and homeschooling.

### Weaknesses:

The applicant does not provide specific information about the information or training that will be provided to parents to support their decision making regarding educational choice. The majority of the services to be provided focus on programs being offered within schools instead of making choices between schools.

**Reader's Score:** 1

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 11/01/2018 06:52 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 11/01/2018 02:34 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Mid-Atlantic Equity Consortium, Inc. (U310A180044)

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

	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	30
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	30
<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	33

# Technical Review Form

Panel #7 - SFEC - 7 - 1: 84.310A

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

Applicant: Mid-Atlantic Equity Consortium, Inc. (U310A180044)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

#### Strengths:

Not required to review this section

#### 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:

Not required to review this section

**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:**

Not required to review this section

**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:**

The evaluation is clearly aligned with each of the project objectives, providing exhaustive descriptions of the quantitative and qualitative evidence that will be collected throughout the grant period. Use of surveys that are similar, yet focused on different stakeholder constituencies is a strong approach to measuring the project's progress toward intended outcomes.

Administering surveys following each training will provide frequent and timely data enabling periodic assessment of progress. (p. 35-36) Monthly check-in meetings with CAFÉ Director (p.42) and quarterly check-in calls with program staff (p.34) provide a solid foundation for evaluating implementation and outcomes. Administering surveys to parents and LEA staff demonstrates a solid plan for gauging the effectiveness of the project in achieving their intended outcomes related to improving students' literacy skills and school readiness. (Pgs 38-40) In addition, interviewing SEA staff about interstate collaboration efforts will provide useful formative evidence about effective processes for this level of collaboration.

The applicant thoroughly details a quasi-experimental evaluation of Objective #5 likely to yield promising or moderate evidence about the project's effectiveness in improving students' readiness for Kindergarten (p. 39), measured through the use of valid and reliable state-adopted Kindergarten assessments.

**Weaknesses:**

None 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:**

The applicant provided four citations, all of which are from the U.S. Department of Education, IES website publications. They included studies that promote literacy using strategies found to have significant positive effects on students' oral language skills, phonological processing and print knowledge. These overlap with the project activities included in Objectives 5 and 6 within the project narrative. (p. 38-41)

**Weaknesses:**

None were 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:**

.

**Weaknesses:**

.

**Reader's Score:** 0

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 11/01/2018 02:34 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 11/02/2018 01:09 AM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Mid-Atlantic Equity Consortium, Inc. (U310A180044)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	30	25
<b>Quality of Management Plan/Project Personnel</b>		
1. Management/Personel	20	10
<b>Adequacy of Resources</b>		
1. Resources	20	20
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	30	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	55
<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	1
<b>Sub Total</b>	3	1
<b>Total</b>	106	56

# Technical Review Form

Panel #7 - SFEC - 7 - 1: 84.310A

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

Applicant: Mid-Atlantic Equity Consortium, Inc. (U310A180044)

## 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 indicates that the conceptual framework for the project includes four components and describes each of those components in details (pp. 3-4). In addition, the applicant provides empirical evidence supporting the use of those components in the context of the current project. The conceptual framework and the four specified components provide a sufficient framework for the proposed project.

The applicant indicates a 3-tiered model of support which provides a clear framework for implementation of the various facets of the project (pp. 8-10).

2) The applicant provides evidence that the main components of the project, including the Academic Parent-Teacher Teams and the Family Literacy Model have demonstrated success in working with parents and children (pp. 5-7). The proposed project components are based on empirical evidence and reflect current research and practice.

3) Part of the proposed project includes providing technical assistance and training/professional development to SEAs, LEAs, schools, and those who are a part of these organizations (teachers, parents, students, etc.) as a way to ensure that the project is sustainable beyond the grant period (pp. 17-19).

In addition, the applicant proposes to create a framework from birth-twelfth grade which will serve the constituency beyond the grant period (p. 18). The development of the framework at the state-level will allow for policy which can be utilized and effect practice beyond the scope of the grant period.

### Weaknesses:

1) It is not clear how the conceptual framework provided on pages 3 and 4 relates to the components of the project that will be implemented such as the 3-tier model described on pages 8-10. The applicant has not provided a clear description of how the four elements of the conceptual framework are being utilized in the project. More specifically, it is not clear which elements of the conceptual framework are related to which goals and milestones in the project.

2) No weaknesses noted

3) No weaknesses noted

### 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) No strengths noted.

2) The applicant indicates that they will collaborate with a number of other agencies to ensure the effective implementation of the grant and provides specific details about the expertise each agency brings to the project (e143-e219). This expertise will support the project well and ensure its effectiveness in implementation.

In addition, the applicant outlines the expertise of the MAEC and indicates the significant amount of experience the MAEC has in implementing grants similar to the proposed project as well as experience with family engagement programs (pp. e125-e137; Appendix A-2).

3) The applicant indicates that there will be 3 full time staff members working on the project and that the Executive Director will be on the project 80% time (pp. e469-e471).. This is a sufficient level of staffing for a project of this size and will ensure that the project is implemented effectively.

4) The qualifications of the key personnel clearly indicate that they have the experience and skills needed to effectively run and implement the grant (pp. 24-26). More specifically, in the CVs included in Appendix B-2 (pp. e435-e444) the key personnel have experience in family engagement and multicultural programming which will serve the proposed project well.

#### Weaknesses:

1) The applicant indicates that they will ensure a diversity of voices throughout the project (pp. 19-20) but only offers very general explanation for how this will be done. There are no specific methods proposed for how parents, teachers, the business community, a variety of disciplinary and professional fields, recipients or beneficiaries of services, or others will be included in the grant activities or have a voice in the implementation of the grant.

2) No weaknesses noted.

3) The applicant does not clearly explain which staff members will be responsible for which objectives and/or milestones

during the course of the project. There is no specified management plan for meeting those objectives and milestones and it is unclear who will be responsible for which components of the project (pp. 13-17 and pp. 21-23). The organizational chart provided on page 23 of the narrative is not specific and does not indicate clearly who will be responsible for which elements of the grant. It is thus unclear who will be responsible for ensuring completion of each of the tasks proposed in the grant.

The applicant provides a set of milestones and indicates what year they will be completed (pp. e432-e434; Appendix B-1). However, there is a lack of clarity about how these milestones connect to the specific project goals and objectives described in the narrative. It is unclear how these milestones will support those goals and objectives and lead to successful implementation of the project.

4) No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 10**

### **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 selected partners described on pages 27-31 have significant experience and knowledge in working with family engagement and working on projects similar to the proposed project. These partners are relevant to this project and each provides a unique set of background knowledge and skills that contributes to the proposed project. In addition, the partners have committed resources, both financial and otherwise to the project which indicates they have a high level of commitment to ensure the project will be successful. The applicant also indicates that each of the partners has committed to four specific sets of responsibilities and requirements to the grant (p. 30) in order to ensure its success.

2) The applicant indicates that there are 2 goals and 6 objectives which will be met over the course of the grant (pp. 31). The activities proposed are significant and hold promise for supporting family engagement. Therefore, the costs are reasonable given the design of the project.

3) The applicant indicates that a significant number of individuals will be served through the 3 tier model (pp. 32-33). The 3-tier model allows for a larger number of individuals to be served both on an individual and group level as well as to provide training which will support additional numbers of individuals. The costs of the project are very reasonable given the number of individuals who will be served through the course of the grant.

#### **Weaknesses:**

- 1) No weaknesses noted.
- 2) No weaknesses noted.
- 3) 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 (completed by evaluation reviewer)

**Weaknesses:**

n/a (completed by evaluation reviewer)

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 (completed by evaluation reviewer)

**Weaknesses:**

n/a (completed by evaluation reviewer)

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 families with information about language immersion programs, international baccalaureate, online education programs, homeschooling, and gifted and talented programming which are all topics that would support families to make informed decisions about their children's educational options (p. e68).

### **Weaknesses:**

Many of the parent activities include a significant online/technology reliant component to them. Since the applicant is proposing to work with populations that may not have access to technology, there is not a plan in place to support those parents who may not be able to utilize the online components (pp. e67-e68).

The applicant lists a number of types of activities that will be provided for parents (p. e68) but it is not clear how these activities are a part of the grant or how they will support increased parental knowledge to make educational choices. They do not explain how often these will be offered, where they will be offered, or how they will be offered to parents which makes it difficult to know whether these will effectively 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.

**Reader's Score:** 1

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 11/02/2018 01:09 AM