

**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: New Mexico Public Education Department (S425B200017)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Highest Coronavirus Burden		
1. Coronavirus Burden	20	0
Quality of Project Services and Project Plan		
1. Project Services/Plan	35	9
Quality of Management Plan / Adequacy of Resources		
1. Management Plan/Resources	25	4
Sub Total	80	13
Total	80	13

Technical Review Form

Panel #4 - FY20 REM - 4: 84.425B

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: New Mexico Public Education Department (S425B200017)

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:

No Strengths noted. The applicant did not address this selection criterion.

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not address this selection criterion.

Reader's Score: 0

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: Pages 11-12 - The applicant addresses equal access based on race, gender, national origin, disability, age, and hiring practices. The applicant provides solutions to discuss how each group will be equitized. (5 points)

Sub-Criterion 1: No strengths noted (0 points)

Sub-Criterion 2: Page 11 - The application identified potential barriers that may impede accessibility for students with visual or other impairments, including language barriers. The application poses a solution to address these barriers using assistive devices. Additionally, the applicant proposes to provide services in multiple languages to address language barriers. Page 11 - The applicant identified knowledge gaps regarding accessibility and accommodations among learning management system (LMS) users. The application proposes a solution by providing professional development on ADA compliance and technology. (4 points)

Sub-Criterion 3: No strengths noted (0 points)

Sub-Criterion 4: No strengths noted (0 points)

Weaknesses:

Sub-Criterion 1: The application does not include a detailed project plan for addressing the absolute priority.

Sub-Criterion 2: The application does not include details of a proposed project. Therefore, the extent to which the project plan will respond to the needs of students cannot be determined.

Sub-Criterion 3: The application does not include details of a proposed project. Therefore, the extent to which remote learning options will be expanded cannot be determined.

Sub-Criterion 4: The application does not include details of a proposed project. Therefore, the extent to which knowledge from research and effective practices that exist cannot be determined.

Reader's Score: 9

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: No strengths noted. (0 points)

Sub-Criterion 2: No strengths noted. (0 points)

Sub-Criterion 3: Page 7 – The application contains a budget that outlines the cost of the project that will include 400,000 user licenses for a statewide learning management system as well as the development of new content that will impact 30 local education agencies. The potential significance of the project to affect a large number of students indicates that the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives. (4 points)

Sub-Criterion 4: No strengths noted. (0 points)

Weaknesses:

Sub-Criterion 1: The application does not include details of a management plan. Therefore, the adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposal cannot be determined.

Sub-Criterion 2: The application does not include an explanation of the proposed funds. Therefore, the extent to which the proposed funds will adequately support the proposal cannot be determined.

Sub-Criterion 3: The application does not include objectives, a design plan, or quantifiable results. Therefore, the extent to which the costs are reasonable and will have a significant impact cannot be determined.

Sub-Criterion 4: The application does not include quantifiable results. Therefore, the extent to which the costs are reasonable concerning the number of people served cannot be determined.

Reader's Score: 4

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

Status: Submitted

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

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: New Mexico Public Education Department (S425B200017)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Highest Coronavirus Burden		
1. Coronavirus Burden	20	0
Quality of Project Services and Project Plan		
1. Project Services/Plan	35	9
Quality of Management Plan / Adequacy of Resources		
1. Management Plan/Resources	25	4
Sub Total	80	13
Total	80	13

Technical Review Form

Panel #4 - FY20 REM - 4: 84.425B

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: New Mexico Public Education Department (S425B200017)

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:

No strengths detected. The applicant did not include the project narrative or project plan.

Weaknesses:

The narrative provided no information about the coronavirus burden.

Reader's Score: 0

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 GEPA statement provides a clear statement of non-discrimination as well as a clear statement of potential barriers and solutions. (5 points)

- (1) The applicant's approach names five connected components that have strong promise: 1) a learning management system, 2) high-quality content, 3) student data systems, 4) a professional learning infrastructure, and 5) communication with families. (2 points)
- (2) No strengths noted. (0 points)
- (3) The applicant demonstrates that the provision of licenses will likely increase access to courses, as will the inclusion of other features such as culturally and linguistically relevant content. (2 points)
- (4) No strengths noted. (0 points)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were detected regarding GEPA.

- (1) The proposal does not provide adequate detail about each of these components, nor how they will fit together to offer compelling learning experiences for students.
- (2) There is no mechanism described within the proposal for determining which new courses will be developed and how quality will be ensured.
- (3) There is not adequate detail about how outreach will target increasing access or sustaining quality. The process by which culturally and linguistically relevant materials will be created is not specified.
- (4) There are no citations to the theoretical or empirical literature.

Reader's Score: 9

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) No strengths noted. (0 points)
- (2) The budget narrative provides for three staff with clearly defined roles and responsibilities who have adequate time devoted to the effort. This commitment to dedicated staff is a major strength given how such efforts are not part of the existing job descriptions of departmental staff. (2 points)
- (3) No strengths noted. (0 points)
- (4) The narrative states that there will be 400,000 user licenses, three cohorts of 30 districts/schools, and two parent guides created because of this work. (2 points)

Weaknesses:

- (1) The applicant did not provide a management plan.
- (2) The applicant did not provide a plan outside of the budget narrative.
- (3) The applicant did not provide a plan.
- (4) The proposal does not provide specific details about a plan for how and when these sites and individuals will be served.

Reader's Score: 4

Status: Submitted

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

Status: Submitted

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

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: New Mexico Public Education Department (S425B200017)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Highest Coronavirus Burden		
1. Coronavirus Burden	20	0
Quality of Project Services and Project Plan		
1. Project Services/Plan	35	8
Quality of Management Plan / Adequacy of Resources		
1. Management Plan/Resources	25	4
Sub Total	80	12
Total	80	12

Technical Review Form

Panel #4 - FY20 REM - 4: 84.425B

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: New Mexico Public Education Department (S425B200017)

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:

No strengths identified.

Weaknesses:

The application package does not include the project narrative or project plan. It provides no facts or statistics to demonstrate how New Mexico's teachers and students have been affected by the coronavirus pandemic.

Reader's Score: 0

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:

Based on the abstract (p. e16), the project aims to provide a statewide Learning Management System (LMS), curate high-quality instructional materials through the Learning Management System, deploy a statewide SIS, offer professional development opportunities, and improve communication channels for all stakeholders, which has the potential to expand and sustain access for underserved students. The project will support both public and non-public schools. barriers and proposed solutions to ensure equal access for underrepresented groups.

Additionally, the GEPA statement (p. e10-e12) describes potential barriers to equal access as well as potential solutions. Further, the applicant speaks to each subgroup specifically, describing how the project will attend to its needs.

Based on the general description provided in the abstract, the proposed project represents a reasonable means by which to expand opportunities for distance learning. In other words, the deployment of a statewide LMS, the curation of effective instructional materials for distance learning, the deployment of an SIS, and the construction of a professional development infrastructure for virtual learning represent a smart approach to expanding distance learning. The abstract (p. e16) provides an overview of the project goals:

- (1) the procurement and implementation of a statewide LMS;
- (2) the acquisition and development of high-quality, standards-aligned content to populate the LMS;
- (3) a statewide purchase of a Student Information System (SIS) to support data exchange and business analytics which will allow PED to assist schools with continuous improvement;
- (4) the development of a professional learning infrastructure to promote effective remote learning; and
- (5) tools and resources to foster communication and support parents with their children's remote learning.

Weaknesses:

The application package includes no plan detailing how the project will ensure access for underserved students. In other words, the authors state in the most general terms what they will do with the funds, but there is insufficient detail to assess the quality and sufficiency of their strategies.

There is no sustained discussion of New Mexico's specific needs, neither is there a full discussion of how the project will respond to student needs.

Given the lack of detail in the application, the reviewer is not able to assess the likelihood that the project's aims can be fulfilled.

The applicant did not provide evidence to suggest that this project has been informed by empirical educational research.

Reader's Score: 8

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 budget narrative offers details related to management responsibilities (p. e68), and the roles defined align well with the project's stated aims related to the LMS. For example, the project's first aim is to expand LMS access, and the budget allocates \$8,135,750 (p. e72) to the work of implementing Canvas throughout the state. Each of the project's other aims (e.g., online course development) is similarly reflected in the budget narrative.

Serving approximately 400,000 students (p. e16), this grant project can be broken down to approximately [REDACTED], which over the grant period is a reasonable investment in New Mexico's students.

Weaknesses:

There is no detailed management plan for the execution of the proposed project. While the budget summary offers a broad yearly account of expenditures, there is insufficient detail to assess the adequacy of the plan. Also, there is no plan for evaluating progress towards project goals.

Given the lack of detail in the application, the adequacy of the funds could not be determined.

The applicant did not include a detailed discussion of the project's design and potential significance. Therefore, the extent to which the costs are reasonable could not be determined.

The applicant did not address sub-criterion 4.

Reader's Score: 4

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