

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/10/2020 10:37 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Colorado Department of Education (S425B200014)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Highest Coronavirus Burden		
1. Coronavirus Burden	20	15
Quality of Project Services and Project Plan		
1. Project Services/Plan	35	20
Quality of Management Plan / Adequacy of Resources		
1. Management Plan/Resources	25	8
Sub Total	80	43
Total	80	43

Technical Review Form

Panel #8 - FY20 REM - 8: 84.425B

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Colorado Department of Education (S425B200014)

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:

2. The application addresses their coronavirus burden and describes factors that has affected their target community. They have presented quantitative data that demonstrates that a disproportionate number of minorities are affected by the COVID outbreak. For example, there were 5.53% of African Americans that had COVID-19 and 38.03% of Hispanics who were affected as compared to the overall African American and Hispanic population of 3.92% and 21.69%. Also, according to a statewide survey, 61% of respondents have lost their job with disparities being more widespread within poorer communities. (e 30-34)

Weaknesses:

The applicant has not fully explained the coronavirus burden as it relates to educational disparities. They have not described how highly effected communities' educational outcomes have been altered due to the coronavirus.

Reader's Score: 15

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:

The applicant has identified some plans to provide equal access and treatment for participants. For example, the applicant has mentioned an Equity conference that will be used to increase awareness of diversity and equity in schools.

1. The applicant has described approaches used to address the priorities for this competition. They will initiate funding groups of schools, districts, families, educators, out-of-school learning providers or community organizations who form Remote Learning Collectives which will focus upon supporting children's academic needs. 20

2. The magnitude of gaps have been clearly identified. For example, a needs inventory was conducted and lack of internet connectivity as well as mental health counseling was identified as an issue. As part of their plan, they will allow funding to address these issues within Remote Learning Collectives. For example, according to a survey, the number of students without access to a Wi-Fi-enabled device was 52,918 statewide, or approximately 6 percent of students, in the districts that responded. The estimated number of students without access to the internet at home was 65,860, or approximately 8 percent of students in districts that responded to the survey. 27

3. The applicant has provided some information regarding the likelihood that their initiatives could expand access to remote learning options and lead to improvements in student outcomes. For example, efforts will include access to funding to hire tutors to supplement remote learning. This would support instruction that could benefit students who need personal one on one teaching. 29

4. None noted.

Weaknesses:

The applicant has not described current outreach efforts to assure that members of all groups are encouraged to participate in SCIP projects. A clear strategy that is inclusive of how they will implement plans to reduce barriers for student populations that may prevent their equitable access or participation especially with regards to disability, age, or national origin has not been offered.

1. None noted.

2. None noted.

3. Clear processes and procedures regarding how funds will be distributed, criteria for receiving funding that includes specific guidelines or conditions for schools, districts, families, educators, out-of-school learning providers etc. to receive funds have not been offered. It is unclear how the applicant will determine the legitimacy of funding requests; therefore it is indeterminable if strategies will be adequate enough to lead to improvements in student outcomes. 21

4. The applicant has not clearly addressed how their choice of services reflects up-to-date knowledge. They have not provided appropriate references that would substantiate the appropriateness of their program. Likewise, they have not adequately addressed the specific educational needs of their target area which would further validate how services would meet those needs.

Reader's Score: 20

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 applicant has provided some information regarding their management plan. For example, they have noted that implementation will occur in 3 phases which includes a plan to provide outreach initiatives. 24-26
2. The application proposes a budget that includes costs for personnel, fringe as well as travel. Total costs are [REDACTED]. 46-47
3. None noted.
4. None noted.

Weaknesses:

1. The applicant has not provided adequate management plans. They have not clearly described staff responsibilities that are linked to specific times and project milestones. Details regarding milestones and specific responsibilities that are depicted within the timeline and would support the implementation and evaluation plan are not delineated. Furthermore, a clear depiction of project oversight and accountability has not been offered.
2. The applicant has not provided an adequate budget narrative that specifically outlines costs for each staff member, specific supplies etc. Likewise, there are no descriptions of staff responsibilities or time dedicated to the project therefore it is indeterminable if costs are sufficient to support the activities of the project.
3. The applicant has not demonstrated how their budget clearly links to the design of their project. For example, they have requested \$50,000 to contract with a vendor for collaborative planning. However, specific project planning activities have not been clearly described. Likewise, \$5,000 in travel costs for onsite visits to collaboratives has been requested, however the details regarding these visits are not described. 47
4. The applicants have not provided clear information regarding how costs are reasonable in relation to the number of persons to be served. They have not provided a clear estimate of the number of people that they plan to provide services to. 47

Reader's Score: 8

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/10/2020 10:37 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/10/2020 11:05 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Colorado Department of Education (S425B200014)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Highest Coronavirus Burden		
1. Coronavirus Burden	20	15
Quality of Project Services and Project Plan		
1. Project Services/Plan	35	17
Quality of Management Plan / Adequacy of Resources		
1. Management Plan/Resources	25	8
Sub Total	80	40
Total	80	40

Technical Review Form

Panel #8 - FY20 REM - 8: 84.425B

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Colorado Department of Education (S425B200014)

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:

(2) The applicant identifies the impact on schools, stating that many did not have the resources or teacher capacity to make the transition from in-person to remote learning (p. e30). In addition, the applicant cites a survey of Colorado parents in which 35 percent said their children had not participated in any remote learning since schools shut down in March (p. e30). This supports Application Requirement 3 that COVID-19 has had a significant impact on students, parents, and schools in the state.

Weaknesses:

(2) The applicant has not clearly described the impact of the coronavirus on schools. Additionally, the applicant does not provide data on the number of students whose schooling was impacted by the virus.

Reader's Score: 15

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:

(1) The applicant proposes the creation of Remote Learning Collectives. These collectives can be made up of groups of schools, districts, families, educators, out-of-school learning providers or community organizations. This proposal builds on the current 21st Century Community Learning Centers model (p. e20), which gives the applicant a frame of reference from an already successful program

(2) The applicant identifies significant gaps in the number of students without access to Wi-Fi enabled devices in the state, and the number of students without access to internet at home. The applicant further states that they believe many families in rural areas have internet speeds that are not fast enough to provide distance learning (pp. e27-28). The proposal would effectively allow collectives to address the needs of these families in more innovative ways, such as providing in-person instruction to small groups of students (p. e22).

Weaknesses:

The applicant has not clearly described 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.

(1) The applicant does not provide a detailed plan on how the proposal would create or take to scale field-initiated educational models for remote learning, instead providing only a list of examples of what collectives might do (pp. e21-22).

(2) The applicant provides examples of what collectives could do, such as hiring a tutor to supplement remote learning for small groups of students (p. e28). It is unclear, however, how the collectives would address the specific gaps or weaknesses to respond to the needs of students. Other than limited internet access, the applicant does not provide information on the gaps faced by students.

(3) The applicant does not provide details on how the proposal would expand remote learning options and lead to improvements in student outcomes.

(4) The applicant references 21st Century Community Learning Centers but does not cite up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice.

Reader's Score: 17

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 applicant does provide a three-phase implementation plan (pp. e24-25).

Weaknesses:

(1) The applicant does not provide clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones, nor a management plan to achieve the objectives on time and within budget.

(2) It is unclear if the funding requested would adequately support the proposed project. The applicant does not provide details other than administrative overhead costs (pp. e46-47).

(3) As the applicant indicates the costs associated with the collectives will vary widely (p. e.46). It is difficult to evaluate if the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project.

(4) As the applicant indicates, the costs associated with the collectives will vary widely (p. e46). Therefore, it is difficult to determine if the costs are reasonable in relation to the number of persons to be served and the anticipated results and benefits.

Reader's Score: 8

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/10/2020 11:05 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/11/2020 05:32 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Colorado Department of Education (S425B200014)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Highest Coronavirus Burden		
1. Coronavirus Burden	20	15
Quality of Project Services and Project Plan		
1. Project Services/Plan	35	12
Quality of Management Plan / Adequacy of Resources		
1. Management Plan/Resources	25	10
Sub Total	80	37
Total	80	37

Technical Review Form

Panel #8 - FY20 REM - 8: 84.425B

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Colorado Department of Education (S425B200014)

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 applicant discusses in detail the way that coronavirus pandemic has impacted a subset of specific communities in addition to the state as a whole (pages 26-35). Specifically, the applicant provides evidence of disproportionate impact on African-American and Hispanic individuals, both of which constitute 50-100% more coronavirus cases than would be justified based on their proportion of the state population.

Weaknesses:

According to the information put forward in the application, the applicant has a low to moderate percentage of students and families without internet access and an economic impact that is below the national average (pages 26-35). Given that the criteria here is to have a "high" coronavirus burden, the evidence is not fully supportive of this criterion.

Reader's Score: 15

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:

Criteria 1

The applicant's proposed project could be considered an exceptional response to the absolute priority for the extent to which it empowers a broad set of local actors to engage in the education of students and leverages existing community organizations/structures through the creation of Remote Learning Collectives to support the academic needs of students (pages 20-25).

Criteria 2

As articulated in the application, the project will include an open call for proposals that allows a broad range of people including families and community organizations to put forth proposals of their own design. The Remote Learning Collectives will be empowered to respond to the specific existing gaps including technology access and mental health services (pages 20-25).

Criteria 3

If executed successfully, a project of this nature could empower families and other stakeholders to design and implement educational supports. Such an approach could be effective because local actors may have the best understanding of student needs and an open approach could be more likely to foster creative solutions that would not come out of a top down approach.

Weaknesses:

Criteria 0

The applicant's plan does not appear to be specifically targeted to the needs of groups traditionally underrepresented or otherwise disadvantaged (pages 20-25) and therefore it does not fully satisfy the terms of selection criteria B. It is not clear from the application how the applicant will ensure that the Remote Learning Collectives serve traditionally underserved students.

Criteria 3

The application does not include specific information or evidence that the applicant's proposed activities will lead to improvements in student outcomes (pages 20-25). While the approach proposed could lead to improved academic outcomes and some potential activities such as tutoring appear promising there is no specific evidence to this extent. Furthermore, it is not clear how the applicant will manage the open-ended nature of the request for groups to create Remote Learning Collectives to ensure that the resulting projects are impactful for academic outcomes. This application suffers for lack of clarity and specificity regarding the processes and protocols according to which application would be reviewed and grant awards generated.

Criteria 2

The applicant does not provide sufficient explanation regarding the specific gaps or weaknesses that have been identified and how the proposed activities will address these gaps and respond to the needs of students (pages 20-25).

Criteria 4

The application does not include specific evidence that the services proposed are based on up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practices (pages 20-25). The application does not include specific references to research or practices. In the absence of specific information, it is not clear that the application satisfies the terms of selection criteria B.

Reader's Score: 12

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:

Criteria 2

The application includes a clear budget that describes the funds requested and how they will be spent (pages 46-47). It appears that the proposed use of funds can adequately support the proposed budget based on the management plan and budget put forth in the application (pages 46-47).

Criteria 3

The application includes a clear budget that describes the funds requested and how they will be spent (pages 46-47). It appears that the proposed use of funds can adequately support the proposed budget based on the management plan and budget put forth in the application (pages 46-47).

Weaknesses:

Criteria 1

The management plan lacks specificity regarding timelines, milestones, and responsibilities (pages 24-25). For example, the application does not identify a project director or otherwise adequately explain the roles and responsibilities of involved staff. The application lacks critical details regarding milestones and specific responsibilities for implementation and evaluation of this project. Without these details, it is difficult to say that the project is likely to succeed.

Criteria 4

The application does not provide clarity regarding the number of students and families who will be served (pages 24-25, 46-47). Without these details, it is not possible to identify whether the costs of the project are reasonable relative to the potential scale of its impact. For example, the applicant includes \$5,000 in travel costs and this number could be too high or too low depending on the number of Remote Learning Collaboratives created.

Reader's Score: 10

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/11/2020 05:32 PM