

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/22/2020 09:45 AM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Nevada Department of Education (S425B200006)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Highest Coronavirus Burden</b>		
1. Coronavirus Burden	20	20
<b>Quality of Project Services and Project Plan</b>		
1. Project Services/Plan	35	32
<b>Quality of Management Plan / Adequacy of Resources</b>		
1. Management Plan/Resources	25	22
<b>Sub Total</b>	80	74
<b>Total</b>	80	74

# Technical Review Form

Panel #4 - FY20 REM - 4: 84.425B

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

Applicant: Nevada Department of Education (S425B200006)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Highest Coronavirus Burden

#### 1. A: Highest Coronavirus Burden (up to 20 Points)

**(2) The extent to which the applicant has a high coronavirus burden based on indicators and information factors identified by the applicant in response to Application Requirement 3. (up to 20 points)**

#### Strengths:

Page 21 – The proposal identified impacts from Covid-19 that included unemployment, statewide revenue, per-pupil funding, increases in positive Covid-19 cases per capita, broadband access, children living in poverty, and the rural student population. The impact of these factors is a strength because the applicant provided statistical evidence to support the assertion that the impact of Covid-19 significantly affected students, parents, and local education agencies within the state.

Page 22 – The unemployment rate is a significant strength. This significance is evident in the data provided that demonstrate the increases in unemployment rates that are higher among individuals that hold at least a Bachelor's degree. The proposal asserts an unemployment rate that is almost 40% less for this group. The proposal aligned these statistics to high school graduation rates and the number of students that are ready to begin college-level courses. The proposal asserts that the impact of Covid-19 would cause students to fall behind, which would impact their preparation for future jobs.

Page 23 – A decrease in statewide revenue was aligned to the need for a decrease in spending for education and per-pupil funding.

#### Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 20

### Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Services and Project Plan

#### 1. B: Quality of Project Services and Project Plan (up to 35 points)

The Secretary considers the quality of project services and project plan.

In determining the quality of the project services and project plan, the Secretary considers the quality and sufficiency of strategies for ensuring equal access and treatment for eligible project participants who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability. (up to 5 points)

In addition, the Secretary considers--

**(1) The extent to which the proposed project is an exceptional approach to absolute priority**

being addressed and includes a detailed project plan for addressing the absolute priority. (up to 10 points)

(2) The extent to which specific gaps or weaknesses in services, infrastructure, or opportunities have been identified and will be addressed by the proposed project to respond to the needs of students. (up to 10 points)

(3) The likelihood that the services to be provided by the proposed project will expand access to remote learning options and lead to improvements in student outcomes. (up to 5 points)

(4) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project reflect up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice. (up to 5 points)

#### **Strengths:**

Sub-Criterion 0: The application identified racial and ethnic minorities and students with disabilities as underserved student groups. The impact of Covid-19 is believed to be higher for the underserved student group. (5 points)

Sub-Criterion 1: Page 27 – The goals of the proposal are followed by key activities that outlay how the goals will be accomplished. For example, Goal 1, Key Activity 1A. The link between goals and activities indicate that the project plan is feasible and will address the absolute priority. (10 points)

Sub-Criterion 2 and 4: Page 25 – The identified challenges in the proposal are data-driven. The data-driven approach is indicated by a baseline statewide survey to develop an understanding of the needs of the state. Quantifiable results are given to show the needs of the state. For example, 14/18 school district have greater than 50% of instructors that need training to deliver high-quality remote learning. (5 points)

Sub-Criterion 3: Page 27 – The state proposes to provide statewide access to all students and educators to a learning management system (LMS). Coursework is free and available to all students. The proposal asserts that differentiation will be available at the student level that will include pacing and scaffolding coursework. Additionally, to ensure standards, courses will have to meet a standardized criterion. Student access will be facilitated by linking the resources to the student information system. Finally, educators will be trained to deliver instruction appropriately. (10 points)

Sub-Criterion 4: Page 28 – The proposal appropriately asserts that priority will be given to math and science because of workforce demands in the fields of math and science. The connection to workforce demands is significant because it indicates that the applicant's decision to focus on these subject areas are data-driven. The applicant asserts that access to coursework that leads to high-wage jobs is not equitable. The success rate in passing AP exams for disparate groups is 50% lower than the state's average. Additionally, the application asserts that students are behind in math and science. The low performance in math and science is significant because five of the seven top jobs in demand in the state are in these fields. (2 points)

#### **Weaknesses:**

Sub-Criterion 0 – No weaknesses noted.

Sub-Criterion 1: No weaknesses noted.

Sub-Criterion 2: The applicant identified parts of the rural community that does not have access to the Internet. It is not clear how students with limited access will take advantage of the LMS if they do not have access to the Internet.

Sub-Criterion 3: No weaknesses noted.

Sub-Criterion 4: The proposal does not align services to research principles or effective practices to deliver online instruction or professional development for educators. Current research is not cited in the proposal.

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Management Plan / Adequacy of Resources**

**1. C: Quality of the Management Plan and Adequacy of Resources (up to 25 points)**

In determining the quality of the management plan and adequacy of resources, the Secretary considers--

- (1) 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. (up to 5 points)**
- (2) The extent to which the proposed use of funds will adequately support the proposed project. (up to 5 points)**
- (3) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project. (up to 5 points)**
- (4) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the number of persons to be served and to the anticipated results and benefits. (up to 10 points)**

**Strengths:**

Sub-Criterion 1: Page 38 – The management plan includes clearly defined objectives that include responsibilities and a timeline for completion. The responsibilities and timeline are clearly defined for each team member. The detailed timeline indicates that the applicant will be able to accomplish the objectives of the plan within budget. (2 points)

Sub-Criterion 2: Page 26 – Page 13 – The applicant will expand the existing Nevada Distance Learning Collaborative and launch a statewide learning management system (LMS). In response to Covid-19, the state identified state-funded emergency relief, Governor's Emergency Education Relief (GEER), to support education that will expire in 2022. The state used a portion of GEER funds to support the statewide LMS for two years. The ESF-REM award will allow the state to extend the number of subscriptions by 44% for an additional three years. (5 points)

Sub-Criterion 3: Page 32 – The proposal provides an outline of specific tasks, activities, and outcomes of the program that will be completed. The quantifiable short and long term goals indicate the potential significance of the proposal and the percent of the impact that will be achieved by the grant proposal. The percent of people that will be impacted by the grant indicates the significance of the project. Page 75 – The budget narrative outlines the costs and the Management plan on page 38 outline the activities which suggest that the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposal. (5 points)

Sub-Criterion 4: Page 32 – The proposal will impact all educators and students within the state. Costs are reasonable for the population that will be served. The proposal clearly identifies the anticipated results and benefits of the proposal indicating the costs are reasonable in relation to the number of persons that will be served. (10 points)

**Weaknesses:**

Sub-Criterion 1: The timeline contains several notations of "on-going" as the timeline for completion of an activity. It is not cleared when the activities will begin and what the milestones will be to determine if the task was accomplished.

Sub-Criterion 2: No weaknesses noted.

Sub-Criterion 3: No weaknesses noted.

Sub-Criterion 4: No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score:** 22

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 07/22/2020 09:45 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/22/2020 09:45 AM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Nevada Department of Education (S425B200006)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Highest Coronavirus Burden</b>		
1. Coronavirus Burden	20	20
<b>Quality of Project Services and Project Plan</b>		
1. Project Services/Plan	35	27
<b>Quality of Management Plan / Adequacy of Resources</b>		
1. Management Plan/Resources	25	20
<b>Sub Total</b>	80	67
<b>Total</b>	80	67

# Technical Review Form

Panel #4 - FY20 REM - 4: 84.425B

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

Applicant: Nevada Department of Education (S425B200006)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Highest Coronavirus Burden

#### 1. A: Highest Coronavirus Burden (up to 20 Points)

(2) The extent to which the applicant has a high coronavirus burden based on indicators and information factors identified by the applicant in response to Application Requirement 3. (up to 20 points)

#### Strengths:

The proposal cites some of the relative rankings of Nevada with respect to health and other indicators that indicate it is a high-need state generally speaking (pp. e18-19), while identifying how state industries largely rely on tourism and gaming. The proposal elaborated clearly on additional factors such as unemployment impact, statewide revenue, per-pupil funding, cases on the rise, broadband access, children living in poverty, and rural student population to demonstrate the impact and burden of COVID-19 in the state (pp. e22-e25). These aspects will influence the extent to which the state and districts will be able to meet the needs of students in the face of greater baseline needs and decreasing state tax revenues. Many of these factors were provided with reference to other states, which makes a strong argument that Nevada is experiencing a larger burden due to COVID-19.

#### Weaknesses:

No weaknesses detected.

Reader's Score: 20

### Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Services and Project Plan

#### 1. B: Quality of Project Services and Project Plan (up to 35 points)

The Secretary considers the quality of project services and project plan.

In determining the quality of the project services and project plan, the Secretary considers the quality and sufficiency of strategies for ensuring equal access and treatment for eligible project participants who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability. (up to 5 points)

In addition, the Secretary considers--

(1) The extent to which the proposed project is an exceptional approach to absolute priority being addressed and includes a detailed project plan for addressing the absolute priority. (up to 10 points)

(2) The extent to which specific gaps or weaknesses in services, infrastructure, or opportunities have been identified and will be addressed by the proposed project to respond to the needs of students. (up to 10 points)

(3) The likelihood that the services to be provided by the proposed project will expand access



**to remote learning options and lead to improvements in student outcomes. (up to 5 points)**

**(4) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project reflect up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice. (up to 5 points)**

**Strengths:**

Overall, the applicant provides a compelling design and rationale for a project with substantial promise to address educational inequities exacerbated by COVID-19.

The proposal states that they have prioritized educators of color and educators with experience with special populations in the selection of Digital Engineers. (4 points)

(1) The applicant provides details about the overall approach to create a consistent learning management system (LMS) across the state, rather than the current landscape of five such platforms, so that there will be economies of scale both for provision of coursework for students as well as professional development for teachers. This system will be integrated with state data systems (p. e28) and academic standards (p. e29). In addition, the proposal would leverage a statewide cadre of Digital Engineers to create content and serve as peer leaders in the work of creating digital learning environments (p. e30). The creation of a standing “Nevada Distance Learning Collaborative” is also likely to support continuing success at scale. (8 points)

(2) The proposal focused primarily on the issue of digital content that is made available for distance learning, as aligned with specific courses and available within a consistent LMS across the state. In addition, professional learning experiences in distance learning formats are also named and addressed through this proposal. The proposal will coordinate with existing regional professional development networks and contribute to a statewide collaborative, both promising strategies for addressing gaps in infrastructure. (10 points)

(3) The proposal will improve the overall quality of the content made available to students for distance learning and offer a single, consistent LMS. Likewise, for teachers, the proposed work would standardize the content of course offerings across the state. (4 points)

(4) The proposal narrative cites an “on-demand” report about current district practice (p. e29) that contextualizes what the current state of practice is, and the needs identified by the field. (1 point)

**Weaknesses:**

Although the proposal states that they have prioritized educators of color and educators with experience with special populations, there is not sufficient specificity about how these criteria were implemented, nor what the results were in the resulting cohort of 63 Digital Engineers (p. e30).

(1) The proposed intervention does not clearly specify pedagogical aspects of the design of digital learning, or the professional learning of teachers. While the platform is clear, the content and pedagogy, which will be critical to the system, are left unspecified.

(2) No weaknesses detected.

(3) The proposal does not explicitly address how the LMS content will meet the needs of specific populations such as English Learners and students with disabilities, who are mentioned as not performing as well as their peers (p. e20). The proposal narrative is largely lacking in empirical or theoretical citations grounding it in the research evidence. For this purpose, citing a for-profit platform such as Canvas is not adequately independent. This lack of grounding is related to the concern above about underspecified pedagogy.

**Reader's Score: 27**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Management Plan / Adequacy of Resources**

**1. C: Quality of the Management Plan and Adequacy of Resources (up to 25 points)**

In determining the quality of the management plan and adequacy of resources, the Secretary considers--

- (1) 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. (up to 5 points)
- (2) The extent to which the proposed use of funds will adequately support the proposed project. (up to 5 points)
- (3) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project. (up to 5 points)
- (4) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the number of persons to be served and to the anticipated results and benefits. (up to 10 points)

**Strengths:**

- (1) The management plan has goals and objectives that are clearly specified in terms of measures and targets as well as milestones. For example, the proposal sets as a long-term goal that 25% of Nevada's students will participate in at least two distance learning courses funded by the grant (p. e32). These goals and objectives are well-aligned to the overall project plan and theory of action and are likely to be achievable within the budget. (4 points)
- (2) The applicant provides a project plan and proposed budget that overall will adequately support the goals and objectives of the project. (4 points)
- (3) Costs of the project are primarily devoted to infrastructure required to offer courses digitally through a commercial LMS (pp. e27-28). These are reasonable and related to existing market rates for such services. (3 points)
- (4) The proposed work has the potential to reach nearly 30,000 educators and 500,000 students, which are both reasonable targets and fits the costs provided for in the budget. (9 points)

**Weaknesses:**

- (1) There is insufficient detail in the narrative about what will happen in out years of the project, and in Year 3 where there is a significant acceleration. More detail is necessary about the scaling of this approach in Year 3. Some of the objectives may not be adequately ambitious (e.g., 10% of educators indicating that the funded activities provide high-quality content and effectively supplements in-person work (p. e32)), and it is difficult to tell from the narrative how these targets would increase over the years of the project in a way that is ambitious and attainable.
- (2) The applicant's budget does not include enough funds to fund time for key project staff to ensure success. Only \$40,000 is budgeted per project year, which may not be enough to support the substantial scale-up in Year 3.
- (3) The amount of work required of Digital Engineers may be too much for the annual [REDACTED] stipend. Given that the monthly deliverables would each require at least a day of work, the stipends may be too low to incentivize participation and quality development.
- (4) Some of the achievement targets for increases because of the system seem modest, such as a 15% increase in the number of students taking accelerated courses. It is difficult to judge without more context about whether these are ambitious and attainable.

**Reader's Score: 20**

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 07/22/2020 09:45 AM



Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/22/2020 09:45 AM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Nevada Department of Education (S425B200006)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Highest Coronavirus Burden</b>		
1. Coronavirus Burden	20	20
<b>Quality of Project Services and Project Plan</b>		
1. Project Services/Plan	35	30
<b>Quality of Management Plan / Adequacy of Resources</b>		
1. Management Plan/Resources	25	21
<b>Sub Total</b>	80	71
<b>Total</b>	80	71

# Technical Review Form

Panel #4 - FY20 REM - 4: 84.425B

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

Applicant: Nevada Department of Education (S425B200006)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Highest Coronavirus Burden

#### 1. A: Highest Coronavirus Burden (up to 20 Points)

(2) The extent to which the applicant has a high coronavirus burden based on indicators and information factors identified by the applicant in response to Application Requirement 3. (up to 20 points)

#### Strengths:

The primary strength of the applicant' discussion of coronavirus burden is the stark economic impacts of shutdowns on Nevada's economy, especially how those impacts will exert downstream effects on the state's capacity to provide high quality education for all students. Nevada, for example, has reported the highest number of unemployment claims in the country (25.3%) (p. 7), which is essentially twice the national average. Moreover, given the degree to which service and tourism, particularly in the form of gaming, influences Nevada's tax revenues, coronavirus-related shutdowns and slowdowns will reduce funding available to schools quite dramatically (p. 7).

When it comes to the equitable distribution of funds across schools, Nevada ranked 48th in the nation (p. 3), suggesting a great need for funding and measures that can help mitigate the extent to which Nevada's underserved students lack equal access to high-quality educational opportunities.

Additionally, the applicant notes that current estimates of coronavirus-related learning losses indicate that students could lose 30% of their overall learning progress, 50% in mathematics alone (p. 5). Given the potential for continued disruptions to traditional schooling over the 2020-2021 school year, it is both likely that such learning losses will be exacerbated and that such losses will disproportionately impact underserved students.

Taken together, the applicant makes a strong case that Nevada's ability to provide equitable, high-quality education is at risk of serious and sustained damage.

#### Weaknesses:

No weaknesses identified.

Reader's Score: 20

### Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Services and Project Plan

#### 1. B: Quality of Project Services and Project Plan (up to 35 points)

The Secretary considers the quality of project services and project plan.

In determining the quality of the project services and project plan, the Secretary considers the quality and sufficiency of strategies for ensuring equal access and treatment for eligible project participants who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability. (up to 5 points)

In addition, the Secretary considers--

(1) The extent to which the proposed project is an exceptional approach to absolute priority being addressed and includes a detailed project plan for addressing the absolute priority. (up to 10 points)

(2) The extent to which specific gaps or weaknesses in services, infrastructure, or opportunities have been identified and will be addressed by the proposed project to respond to the needs of students. (up to 10 points)

(3) The likelihood that the services to be provided by the proposed project will expand access to remote learning options and lead to improvements in student outcomes. (up to 5 points)

(4) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project reflect up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice. (up to 5 points)

**Strengths:**

A key strength of this project is that the expanded distance learning infrastructure will provide accelerated coursework (e. g., Advanced Placement courses) with special focus on students in rural schools where such coursework is unavailable as well as those students considered “at-risk” (p. 19). In this way, the project explicitly targets equality of access to underrepresented individuals.

Another strength in this project is that it will increase the capacity of the Nevada Distance Learning Collaborative (NvDLC), a coronavirus-inspired initiative aimed at targeting Nevada’s rural and underserved communities with virtual coursework designed to support “high-wage, high-skill jobs that have been identified as the fastest growing in Nevada’s economy” (p. 12). Consisting of a wide range of experts and stakeholders, the NvDLC will use grant funding to support the Learning Management System (LMS) expansion and create and curate evidence-based curricula.

Another key strength of this proposal is the attention to “high-quality professional development for delivering distance education” (p. 2). Although teachers throughout the country adapted quickly and responsively to the sudden shift to online classes, there will be a need for professional development sharply focused on using an expanded LMS effectively in conjunction with high-quality instructional materials.

In light of the degree to which Nevada has experienced a “lack of consistency among learning management systems (LMS) in-use across the state” (p. 10), the project represents a robust effort to unify distance education state-wide through a centralized LMS with carefully curated educational content, all of which will be free for Nevada’s 17 school districts and charter schools. Such a project addresses a specific weakness in Nevada’s distance-learning infrastructure and represents a bold approach to strengthening it.

Given the project’s ongoing evaluation plans related to the LMS, there is a reasonable likelihood that access will be expanded. For example, the project proposes to work with third-party analytics partners to measure the effectiveness of provided professional development (p. 15). Indeed, working with analytics partners, the state will conduct sustained data-driven evaluations of the entire program in an effort to establish benchmarks and goals and identify progress (p. 20). The applicant explains that the purpose of such ongoing evaluation is to determine how successfully the grant funding has been allocated in relation to project outcomes.

Finally, Key Activity 2B’s commitment to research-based practice and cultural competence represent a strength of this project (p. 16).

**Weaknesses:**

While the general project could ensure access to underrepresented groups, especially those in rural areas, there is a lack of detail in the application itself as to (1) how their strategies will target underrepresented groups and (2) how the project will evaluate the extent to which they have ensured access for such students as indicated by the Secretary.

Although the applicant speaks to the role research will play in the curation of high-quality professional development and instructional materials, the applicant does not cite research to support the claim that an expanded statewide LMS will support student learning outcomes.

Furthermore, there is no research cited to support the efficacy of the “Discovery Learning” service.

Broadly, it is unclear what, if any, research-based pedagogical framework will inform the state’s expansion of distance learning.

**Reader's Score: 30**

### **Selection Criteria - Quality of Management Plan / Adequacy of Resources**

#### **1. C: Quality of the Management Plan and Adequacy of Resources (up to 25 points)**

**In determining the quality of the management plan and adequacy of resources, the Secretary considers--**

- (1) 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. (up to 5 points)**
- (2) The extent to which the proposed use of funds will adequately support the proposed project. (up to 5 points)**
- (3) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project. (up to 5 points)**
- (4) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the number of persons to be served and to the anticipated results and benefits. (up to 10 points)**

#### **Strengths:**

The project’s logic model (pp. 17-18) and management plan (p. 23-24) provide a clear and achievable process for achieving the project’s goals. The logic model is organized around the project’s primary objectives, and it delineates the resources, activities, and goals for each objective, providing a clear roadmap to success for the project team.

A particular strength of this project is the dissemination plan (p. 18), which builds on existing infrastructure to deliver timely news, information, and updates to project stakeholders.

Additionally, the grant application details the people, organizations, responsibilities, and timelines required to fulfill the project’s aims, and like the logic model, the management plan is organized around the project’s core objectives.

Based on the budget narrative, the requested funds should prove adequate to achieving the project’s aims. In addition to providing a detailed breakdown of funding allocations for each year of the grant period, the applicant have provided notes (pp. e75-e76) that justify the various expenses, explaining how the funds will be directed in particular ways to support the project’s goals.

A key strength of the project’s management plan is to use grant funding to create a sustainable foundation for the LMS expansion such that it continues beyond the grant award period (p. 16).

Another key strength of the budget is that funding allocations align clearly with the project plan, with most of the funding going to Canvas and Discovery Learning.

Focusing on students alone, this project will cost approximately [REDACTED] per student over the period of the grant while also supporting the development of courses and infrastructure that will extend beyond the grant, which is a more than reasonable cost.

**Weaknesses:**

While “access to technological capacity for educators, students, and students” was both identified as a priority by the NDE and SBOE and also linked to “outcome #1” of the proposal (p. 2), the applicant discussion of such capacity is limited to server-side infrastructural support with no attention to user-side device support.

A similar problem relates to broadband internet access: If 65% of Nevada’s rural population is without broadband access, it is unclear how an LMS expansion will benefit rural students in the event of school closures and/or blended at-school and at-home instruction, which is particularly concerning for the near term.

Given that up to 77% of students may not have reliable access to a web-connected device, it is unclear that all the LMS subscriptions purchased will be used by students. Although the applicant describe a plan for assessing participation by measuring login rates, there is no discussion of how the project will respond should login rates be lower than hoped and/or expected.

Additionally, it is unclear why the project has decided upon a “scaffolded implementation” of the LMS such that 200,000 subscriptions will be purchased in the first year. While in normal circumstances such an implementation might reflect a circumspect approach to the introduction of a new educational tool, in current circumstances a scaffolded rollout will leave the remaining 295,000 (approximately) students without LMS access for the 2020-2021 school year, which could be problematic in the event of school closures.

It is unclear from the budget narrative whether and how [REDACTED] annually towards personnel will prove sufficient to guide a project of this scope and ensure its quality.

Similarly, it is unclear if the digital engineers are being paid enough for the work they are being asked to do, particularly if the expectation is that they produce high-quality work. Looking at the digital engineer contract, it appears as they are being asked to produce a considerable amount of content each month for what comes down to [REDACTED] which seems quite low if the goal is to incentivize expert work. Put simply, this work deserves more money than has been allocated.

**Reader's Score:** 21

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 07/22/2020 09:45 AM