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

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Hawaii State Department of Education (S425B200018)
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	35
Quality of Management Plan / Adequacy of Resources			
1. Management Plan/Resources		25	10
	Sub Total	80	60
	Total	80	60

Technical Review Form

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

Applicant: Hawaii State Department of Education (S425B200018)

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 a high coronavirus burden and includes some data that substantiates the need for their project. For example, they have noted a high unemployment rate (37%) due to the coronavirus which has affected their most rural and remote areas. Also, Hawaii has pockets of residential areas that lay outside of network coverage regions. Those residing in these remote areas often lack the financial means to connect to the internet and are in many cases in need of educational services, technology devices, and related supports. Likewise, they propose to provide services to mitigate the risk of experiencing additional educational challenges due to the impact of COVID-19 in these high poverty, complex areas especially with regards to English Learners, those with disabilities and those who are economically disadvantaged. Pages 18, 21-22, 24

   Weaknesses:

   The applicant has not provided complete information regarding the burden within their target area. They have noted that students with disabilities, English learners, economically disadvantaged students, and students experiencing unstable housing need to be provided with efficient and effective instruction to address the negative impact of lost instructional time, the
   challenges of remote learning, and language regression, however the magnitude of these needs have not been explained. Clear data that explains how COVID-19 has contributed to or exacerbated these disparities have not been offered. Page 23

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 clearly identified a plan to provide equal access and treatment for participants. Efforts that ensure that members of all groups are included have been noted. Strategies will address appropriate accommodations such as offering multilingual services, transportation, printing materials in multiple languages etc. This will ensure that those with disabilities. Language barriers etc. have access to program materials. Page 10

1. The applicant has clearly described approaches used to address the priorities for this competition. They will initiate services that will increase access to remote learning and includes mobile learning hubs, vehicles equipped with mobile routers, computer devices, and other forms of media. This will be a novel approach as they will provide a variety of opportunities for students to partake in technology-rich learning environments with both physical and virtual components that provide formal and informal opportunities for learners to come together with peers, teachers, and other support services. These resources are appropriate as they will allow access to technology for all students especially those in remote communities. Page 14

2. Technology gaps within the target area have been clearly identified. They have noted that internet connectivity within the state is an issue and they have collaborated regularly with the Hawaii Broadband Hui to coordinate efforts across state agencies and with industry partners, to advance access to technology and high bandwidth in Hawaii. Likewise, the applicant's plan will address this issue as they will deploy mobile learning hubs to areas lacking consistent internet connectivity. This will also allow mobile routers, computer devices, and other forms of media to provide access for all students and thus fill the technology gap. Page 24

3. The applicant has sufficiently demonstrated how their project will expand access to remote learning options and lead to improvements in student outcomes. To address students' needs within rural areas, mobile learning hubs will include bilingual support personnel which was identified as a need within their target area. This will undoubtedly allow students with language barriers equal access to technology support which will facilitate increased remote learning capabilities. Also, the applicant has identified teacher vacancies within their rural communities and they will address this issue by providing virtual academies that offer online instruction by high quality licensed teachers which will allow efficient distance learning for students. Pages 25, 26

4. The applicant has clearly addressed how their choice of services reflects up-to-date knowledge. For example, to address how they will provide high-quality remote learning, they will utilize a design that incorporates 5 evidence-based elements. Initiatives include: 1) student-centered environment, 2) collaborative and interactive learning, 3) increased flexibility, 4) immediate feedback, and 5) multimodal content. This aligns with their offerings as they will offer virtual academies that will allow flexible, interactive learning environments spearheaded by licensed teachers. Likewise, they will utilize the National Education Association's Guide to Online High School Courses to ensure the successful implementation of online courses. Pages 10-11

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 35

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 will hire a vice principal to serve the administrator of the academy, six core program teachers, a guidance counselor, and an educational assistant. Likewise, a timeline has been provided that aggregates activities by year and includes the establishment of a project team as well as plans to develop a monitoring and reporting system. Pages 11-14
   2.The application proposes a budget to support the activities of the project. Proposed expenditures are outlined in areas of personnel, supplies, travel, and supplies/equipment. The total cost of the program is ███████. Page 55
   3.Their budget clearly provides a budget narrative that shows reasonable costs in relation to activities and services proposed such as travel, equipment as well as supplies. For example, they have requested 7 Solar Routers @$4500 each, for each hub which equals $31,500, which seems reasonable as this is a one-time cost that will not reoccur throughout the 36-month time period.

   4.None noted.

   Weaknesses:

   1.The applicant has not provided adequate management plans. They have not clearly provided oversight duties that correlate with project milestones which is needed to ensure that activities stay on time and within budget. Also, the applicant has not clearly described who will have the authority to effectively oversee the project, which would include a description of appropriate professional qualifications, experience, and administrative skills. This is needed to ensure that the project is administered by a qualified individual who will have the managerial experience to keep the project progressing effectively.

   2. The applicant has not provided complete information that will assure that funds requested will adequately address activities, objectives etc. For example, the applicant has not provided the specific salary for positions such as a vice principal, six (6) core program teachers, a guidance counselor, and an educational assistant. Therefore, it is indeterminable if the salary amount requested is appropriate for each position. Page 50

   3. None noted.

4.The applicant has 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, therefore it is difficult to determine the reasonableness of costs. Page 52

Reader's Score: **10**

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

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/10/2020 11:04 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Hawaii State Department of Education (S425B200018)
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	33
Quality of Management Plan / Adequacy of Resources			
1. Management Plan/Resources		25	23
	Sub Total	80	71
	Total	80	71

Technical Review Form

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

Applicant: Hawaii State Department of Education (S425B200018)

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 addresses some of the required indicators of the coronavirus burden in their state, including the state's historic high unemployment rate of 37%, which is a 1,100 percent increase from the same point last year due to the coronavirus (p. e20).

   The applicant states that the cumulative effect of the coronavirus will have a detrimental effect on students in remote areas of the state (p. e20).

   Weaknesses:

   While the applicant states that the impact of the coronavirus will have a detrimental effect on students in remote areas of the state, no data is given to support this claim. The applicant also does not clearly explain the impact of the virus on schools.

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 provided some 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. First, the applicant identifies the scope of the need in their target remote areas. For example, the applicant lists the percentages of students from traditionally underrepresented groups: students with disabilities (10.6%); English learners (9.1%); students in Title 1 schools (79%) (pp. e21-22). The applicant provides details on what services are currently being provided for students with disabilities and English learners, and how the project will increase those services. For example, each Mobile Learning Hub will have English language support personnel (p. e25).

(1) The applicant provides a detailed project plan with a high likelihood to create and expand remote educational options to the most underserved populations in the state. The applicant does this by proposing two tactics: Mobile Learning Hubs and Virtual School-Within-a-School (p. e24-25).

The applicant provides a detailed three-year implementation plan and timeline, including responsibilities for the state's department of education, as well as for each of the two tactics (pp. e.28-35). The timeline, responsibilities, and goals provide a clear step-by-step process that engenders confidence in the success of the program.

(2) The applicant identifies lack of technology in remote areas as the gap they are trying to address through this project. The Mobile Learning Hubs would help address this gap by bringing technology into remote areas (pp. e24-25).

(3) The applicant has provided some information regarding the likelihood that the project could expand access to remote learning options and lead to improvements in student outcomes. For example, providing internet access to students in areas with no broadband. This would allow students to participate in blended and distance learning opportunities (p. e25).

(4) The applicant aligns the project plan with research on evidence-based practices for remote learning (p.e26). In addition, the applicant uses the National Education Association's Guide to Online High School Courses to develop their on-line courses (p. e27)

Weaknesses:

(1) The applicant provides no rationale for the number of Mobile Learning Hubs needed (p. e24).

(2) The applicant has identified areas in the state, which they refer to as "complexes," where the technology gap is substantial. However, the applicant provides no statistics to show what that gap is (p. e24). It is difficult to determine if the proposal can address the gap if the scope and size of the gap is not identified.

(4) The applicant states that they believe targeted professional development will address the challenges of a pseudo-blended learning model but provide on evidence to support this claim (p. e26).

Reader's Score: 33

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 provides some information regarding their management plan. For example, the plan lists some responsibilities for the state Department of Education (p. e32). Additionally, the applicant provides a three-year implementation plan and timeline (pp. 28-32).

(2) The applicant provides some details on the proposed use of funds to adequately support the project. For example, the include the costs to outfit the seven mobile learning hubs with technology and personnel (p. e50; pp. e51-52; e53), as well as the costs to outfit each of the two Virtual School-Within-a-School academies (pp. e50-51; e. 52; e53).

(3) The applicant has provided some information about how the costs are reasonable in relation to the project. For example, the applicant lists the specific cost of technology and infrastructure needed for the Mobile Learning Hubs and the Virtual School-Within-a-School (pp. 51-52).

Weaknesses:

(1) The applicant has not provided information about staff responsibilities, detailed timelines, or project milestones. Without these, it is difficult to determine if the management plan is adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget.

Reader's Score: 23

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/10/2020 11:04 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Hawaii State Department of Education (S425B200018)
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	35
Quality of Management Plan / Adequacy of Resources		
1. Management Plan/Resources	25	16
Sub Total	80	66
Total	80	66

Technical Review Form

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

Applicant: Hawaii State Department of Education (S425B200018)

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 application's discussion of the state's special populations - specifically students with special needs and English Language Learners - is clear and incisive with adequate information to understand the impact of coronavirus and the associated challenges of remote learning (pages 6 and 7).

   While the application notes that the direct impact of coronavirus has been low, it does provide specific evidence of the disproportionate economic impact due to the state's reliance on tourism and the associated consequences for unemployment and the state's fiscal health (pages 3 and 4).

   Weaknesses:

   While the applicant includes evidence of coronavirus's impact it also notes specifically that Hawaii has relatively few cases and a low coronavirus burden based on traditional measures (page 3).

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 0

The strategies put forth by the applicant are specifically connected to ensuring equal access and treatment for eligible project participants who are members of groups that have been traditionally under-represented according to the terms of this grant (pages 5-10, 8-12).

Criteria 1

The applicant's proposed approach is a clear and specific response to the absolute priority and includes a detailed project plan (pages 8-12). The applicant's proposed use of mobile learning hubs and virtual schools should address technology access challenges and be especially impactful for student subgroups identified. Taken as a whole, the applicant's proposed services seem very likely to expand access to remote learning options and lead to improvements in student outcomes (pages 7-11) based on the specific evidence provided in the application regarding technology access gaps in Hawaii and student learning challenges due to these technology gaps.

Criteria 2

Furthermore, these strategies appear to be directly responsive to the specific gaps and weaknesses identified. The applicant has identified clear technology gaps and explained how their plan will address these gaps through the deployment of mobile learning hubs to areas without strong connectivity. These hubs will provide students with access to the internet they need to succeed in a remote learning environment (pages 5-12)

Criteria 3
and 3

The applicant's proposed approach is a clear and specific response to the absolute priority and includes a detailed project plan (pages 8-12). The applicant's proposed use of mobile learning hubs and virtual schools should address technology access challenges and be especially impactful for student subgroups identified. Taken as a whole, the applicant's proposed services seem very likely to expand access to remote learning options and lead to improvements in student outcomes (pages 7-11) based on the specific evidence provided in the application regarding technology access gaps in Hawaii and student learning challenges due to these technology gaps.

Criteria 4

Based on the written application (pages 7-11), the applicant's proposed services appear to reflect up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practices. The applicant's proposed approach is concordant with the National Education Association's Guide to Online High School Courses which emphasizes five key components: 1) student-centered environment, 2) collaborative and interactive learning, 3) increased flexibility, 4) immediate feedback, and 5) multimodal content.

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 35

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 1
While not sufficiently detailed to earn all available points, the management plan does include some strong elements with clear activities to be accomplished on a timeline that appears to be reasonable and is comprehensible (pages 15-20). It is clear from the management plan that the applicant intends to hire a number of staff including, but not limited to, a vice principal, and six core teachers., and others.

Criteria 2
The budget is clear and coherent. The proposed use of funds should adequately support the proposed project.

Criteria 3
The applicant's project costs appear to be reasonable in relation to the proposed project's objectives,d design, and potential significance. The upfront costs for the project include approximately $35,000 for solar routers which seems reasonable given the project.

Criteria 4
While not sufficiently detailed to receive all available points, due in part to lack of clarity about the number of persons to be served, the costs identified do appear to be reasonable relative to the anticipated results of this project in terms of technology access and student learning.

Weaknesses:

Criteria 1
The management plan does not have a sufficient level of specificity regarding responsibilities and milestones for accomplishing project tasks (pages 15-20), specifically it lacks adequate information regarding the staff to be hired and involved in the task (e.g. job descriptions and salaries). The application does not include adequate specificity regarding who will oversee the project and without this information it is difficult to determine whether the plan will have suitable managerial oversight.

Criteria 4
While the budget may be suitable relative to the potential impact of the project, the application itself does not provide

specific evidence of this because it does not give adequate information regarding the number of students to be reached. This shortfall makes it impossible to give full credit for item four of this criterion.

Reader's Score: **16**

_____

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/11/2020 05:33 PM