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: Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (S425B200024)
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	13
Quality of Management Plan / Adequacy of Resources			
1. Management Plan/Resources		25	10
	Sub Total	80	38
	Total	80	38

Technical Review Form

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

Applicant: Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (S425B200024)

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 identified an urban district (Milwaukee Public Schools, aka MPS) which has been impacted by covid-19 and lacks broadband services. MPS has very low broadband access (22.6% without access) and 82.2% of the population is identified as economically disadvantaged families, showing a need of essential jobs (p.e33).

   Weaknesses:

   The applicant focused on a single urban district which does not reflect an overall state COVID-19 impact. The applicant does not demonstrate a need in additional remote, rural areas of the state.

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's strategy was well articulated and demonstrates equal access and treatment for eligible project participants. Particularly those who are members of groups identified as traditionally underrepresented. MPS district reflects a need and has a population of 89.9% students of color and 47.2% students scored below basic level in their state's English Language Achievement tests. (p. e26)

Sub-criterion 1- The applicant's project plan is to purchase and the lend out 10,000 Chromebooks with broadband, and another 10,000 Chromebooks without broadband which address students without adequate access to online learning (p. e51). In addition, the plan enables students and their families to access a menu of choices of software and services which supports student learning (p. e24).

Sub-criterion 2- The situation analysis shows how the microgrant will deliver Chromebooks with a bundled Internet Service Provider contract to students and their families (p. e51).

Sub-criterion 3- The applicant proposes Microgrants will help expand access to 20,000 students using Chromebooks at any given time.

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses:
Underrepresented students: The applicant description of one district need lacks support of other districts experiencing covid-19 impacted and underrepresented students in other parts of the state, including both urban, remote, and rural areas .

Sub-criterion 1- The Department of Public Instruction plan "to approve a plan from MPS to develop and execute a districtwide plan…" (e19) is insufficient.

Sub-criterion 2- Provisions to help students and parents determine which services to access is not clear.

Sub-criterion 3- Expansion of service is limited to students who are served by a single district, in a single city.

Sub-criterion 4- The administrative and logistics costs of owning, lending, returning, and redeploying inexpensive devices, i.e. Chromebooks is not justified and undetermined whether the plan consists of issuing students and their families the devices. Finally, there is no indication if instructive practices are employed for one or more services and, if it would be accessible.

Reader's Score: 13

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 2- The proposed budget is sufficient and reasonable related to the purchase of specified equipment (p. e51).

Weaknesses:

Sub-criterion 1- Staffing levels (pp. e49-350) are insufficient and does not support the purchase of 20,000 Chromebooks, when users are considered novice with little technology training or support.

Sub-criterion 2- The plan does not detail a Chromebook check-out or lending procedures. The plan does not specify any associated personnel or systems to manage this check-out process.

Sub-criterion 3- No weaknesses noted; there is adequate funding to purchase the Chromebooks.

Sub-criterion 4- The applicant plans to incur all spending in year 1 of the grant, and does not identify how many students will be served in any period.

Reader's Score: 10

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

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (S425B200024)
Reader #2:   **********

		Points Possible	**Points Scored**
Questions			
Selection Criteria			
Highest Coronavirus Burden			
1. Coronavirus Burden		20	16
Quality of Project Services and Project Plan			
1. Project Services/Plan		35	13
Quality of Management Plan / Adequacy of Resources			
1. Management Plan/Resources		25	12
	Sub Total	80	41
	Total	80	41

Technical Review Form

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

Applicant: Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (S425B200024)

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 cites race-based achievement gaps, as well as high rates of poverty and relatively low achievement within their partner LEA, Milwaukee Public Schools. (p. e25) These factors put students at significant risk for academic failure when they also lack access to high-quality in-person instruction, as has been the case during the pandemic. The applicant has selected their largest school district, with the most impoverished population of students, demonstrating this district has been significantly affected by the burdens related to COVID-19 due to a lack of access to devices and internet. (p. e33)

  Weaknesses:

  The applicant is the state education agency but the only information provided on need reflects a single school district. The applicant doesn't provide convincing evidence that the bulk of their   state's impact lies only in Milwaukee.

Reader's Score: 16

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:

Strategies to ensure equal access: The applicant clearly explains their rationale for selecting Milwaukee Public Schools as the district to benefit from this grant, since this LEA includes a high percentage of students of color, and students living in poverty.

Sub-criterion 1: The plan addresses absolute priority 1 by spending approximately 2/3 of the funds purchasing devices and internet access for impoverished families in order to facilitate remote learning. The plan also includes a variety of additional supports, such as library services and parent support services (p. e20) which is vital to the success of remote learning, particularly with families who previously lacked access to such technological tools and are having to learn how to support their students' use. Providing technology support services is also a good strategy to address successful implementation. (p. e21)

Sub-criterion 2: The applicant cited specific achievement gaps in ELA and Math across all grade levels. (p. e26-e29) and also indicates over 22% of households lack access to internet service which they are attempting to address with grant funds.

Sub-criterion 3: The distribution of 20,000 devices along with 10,000 internet access bundles will ensure increased access to remote learning options among low-income families in Milwaukee. (p. e51)

Sub-criterion 4: The applicant demonstrates a solid understanding of the need for technical support when distributing technological tools that are new to the end users. Providing one-on-one support and guidebooks for families (p. e23) are considered to be effective practices.

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses:
Strategies to ensure equal access: No details are provided about how this grant will provide services to students with disabilities, or ensure they have equitable access to course content.

Sub-criterion 1: Very little detail is provided about the "outside of school programming" or the "academic support services" options available to parents. (p. e20) Further, the applicant states the project will be "Preparing teachers with the tools and skills necessary to provide instruction aligned to the instructional standard of care" (p. e19) but very little detail is provided about how they will accomplish this. The 8-hour training described on page e49, only for 250 educators 'new to the instructional technology' will not be a sufficient amount of training to ensure all teachers can provide remote learning that is of the same quality and rigor as face-to-face instruction and support.

Sub-criterion 2: Page e33 indicates that only 9.18% of students lack access to devices, so it is unclear how a project devoted almost entirely to the purchase/distribution of devices will serve to support all students' academic needs. The applicant cites several areas of low achievement (p. e26-e29) but there is little detail about how the project will support the delivery of specific content standards, and how the availability of remote learning options will address the identified achievement gaps and needs.

Sub-criterion 3: It is not clear how the proposed project will lead to improved student outcomes. In addition, the plan for data collection is to examine student academic growth and levels of students' engagement with online resources in May 2021 when the school year is over. (P. e23-e24)Waiting until the end of the year to examine data on how/when students

are accessing digital resources, or making academic growth will not provide timely information necessary to modify the delivery of remote learning to increase effectiveness.

Sub-criterion 4: The application does not include any research-based sources or citations. The application does not include any indication the applicant has reviewed research or 'best practices' from national organizations focused on technology integration or online learning, such as the International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE) or the National Council for Online Education (NCOE). These national organizations could provide a wealth of guidance on best practices and research related to effective delivery models for online learning.

Reader's Score: 13

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: The applicant provides a detailed plan for the distribution of devices, along with specific timelines for the outreach and support activities planned. (p. e23)

   Sub-criterion 2: The applicant proposes using a majority of the funding to purchase devices an internet for impoverished families, which represent over 80% of their students. (p. e24, e33)

   Sub-criterion 3: The cost of the chromebooks @ ▮▮▮▮▮ (p. e51) is reasonable. In addition, the cost of approximately $500 additional for the cost of Verizon wireless service for 12 months is also reasonable. Supporting outreach activities via funding for community partners also represents an effective strategy for supporting families' needs during remote learning.

   Sub-criterion 4: The applicant plans to purchase 20,000 devices and 10,000 internet access bundles (p. e51) which will adequately support their plan to greatly increase families' access to remote learning options.

Weaknesses:

Sub-criterion 1: While resumes are included in the appendix (p. e36-e50), no specific information is provided about what these individuals will contribute to the project. In addition, the management plan on page e22-e23 does not provide any timelines for when devices and internet will be purchased, when contracts with Verizon will be executed, or when teacher training will occur and with whom.

Sub-criterion 2: Very little funding is allocated to teacher training. The budget includes a stipend for an 8-hour training for 250 teachers, which represents a very small fraction of their total teaching staff. While the budget also includes funding for four instructional technology coaches, this will likely be insufficient number of coaches to support all of the teachers, and they are also likely to lack to content knowledge necessary to support teachers delivery of high-quality remote learning. (p. e49) The stipends for 1.5 hr after-school sessions included in the budget for teachers provides a vague description of what these sessions will entail or who will lead them. (p. e49) Further, they are open to both teachers and families so it is not clear what the focus of each session will be or how useful they will be to teachers.

Sub-criterion 3: Given the low achievement cited by the applicant, funding for additional instructional materials would be important, particularly for students in the lower, elementary grades. The applicant only allocates ███████ divided among many non-profits (p. e52), listing four and stating it will include "many more". This is not a reasonable amount of funding given the extensive need for academic support/enrichment, tutoring, and mentoring likely to be needed by families in this impoverished region of the state.

Sub-criterion 4: The applicant does not specifically state the number of students that will be impacted by the grant. While they plan to do a survey of technology needs (p. e21), it is not clear how many students/families will be impacted. The applicant does not provide the total number of students educated in MPS, only providing demographic percentages and stating 9% lack devices and 22% lack internet. The applicant plans to expend all the funds in Year 1 which is also not sufficient.

Reader's Score: **12**

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

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (S425B200024)
Reader #3:   **********

		Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions			
Selection Criteria			
Highest Coronavirus Burden			
1. Coronavirus Burden		20	12
Quality of Project Services and Project Plan			
1. Project Services/Plan		35	15
Quality of Management Plan / Adequacy of Resources			
1. Management Plan/Resources		25	12
	Sub Total	80	39
	Total	80	39

Technical Review Form

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

Applicant: Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (S425B200024)

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:

   Sub-criterion 2: Absolute Priority 1 - Pages e30-33 present the data to support the need for computer hardware and internet access for students in the Milwaukee School district. WDPI presents a strong case for intervention for their students - low performance on state assessments and persistent poverty in certain areas of the district, and indicators show a negative effect caused by Covid-19.

   Weaknesses:

   Sub-criterion 2: Page e16 states Milwaukee has "one of the highest poverty rates in the state at just over 83%." The WDPI does not demonstrate why Milwaukee was chosen over other cities/counties in Wisconsin that have the same or higher percentage of poverty. Wisconsin data does not reflect evidence Milwaukee district has been impacted by Covid-19 and the neediest school system in the state.

Reader's Score: **12**

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 1: The applicant details a strategy and an effective work plan to implement microgrants (Pages e22-24).

Sub-criterion 2: The applicant's plan to include parents show an effective method of increasing parental involvement and demonstrates support to help parents increase their online learning while assisting their students. The project plan addresses the gaps in internet service and access to computer hardware for students and their families. Students and families that do not have hardware and/or broadband will have the opportunity to apply for a microgrant and have access to a variety of online services.

Sub-criterion 3: The project targets the most vulnerable population in Milwaukee which are students living in poverty and low-performing students on state assessments. The online learning component demonstrates an effective method to improving student performance on state assessments.

Sub criterion 4: See weaknesses

Weaknesses:

The project plan does not address students "who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability." There is insufficient information on how WDPI will help these students/families' access microgrants to improve student learning.

Sub-criterion 1: The plan as described on pages e20-24 may increase student access to the internet, but little details provided on online course content/standards and how it will improve student achievement.

Sub-criterion 2: On page e19, the applicant states that training for teachers will be 8 hours which is very little if they are expected to match the quality level of classroom instruction.

Sub-criterion 3: Page e20 lists choice selections for parents to use microgrants which is vague and confusing, "Educational services provided by a public school (MPS); Library services; Outside of school programming; Academic support services; Computer software and hardware (if families do not currently have similar hardware or software); Internet access or hotspots (families must certify they do not currently have access); Instructional materials." The applicant does not specify how they will evaluate student achievement or link parent choice/selection to student achievement.

Sub criterion 4: There was no mention of research or effective practices in the application or project plan.

Reader's Score: 15

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: See weaknesses

Sub-criterion 2: The budget is reasonable in relation to the number of persons receiving computer hardware and internet services.

Sub-criterion 3: See weaknesses

Sub criterion 4: See weaknesses

Weaknesses:

Sub-criterion 1: "One on-one support, training and professional development will coincide with the tools identified for expansion over the 2020 summer. The project budget allocates resources for each grade band (K-5, 6-8 and 9-12) to enhance MPS's ability to support families who need to learn remotely" (page e52). This statement is not explained in the narrative and the reader has no information on how the needs of K-5 and 6-8 will be addressed. There are no descriptors for the tools for expansion for K-5 and 6-8. The applicant does not explain how resources will be used for these grade bands.

Sub-criterion 2: The budget does not extend into year 2 and does not state that the work of the new hires/contractors will continue into year 2. The WDPI expects to complete all the work in one year which is difficult given that procurement and hiring personnel is time consuming. There is no explanation provided as to why they chose to expend all the funds in year one. Supports provided by technology coaches, instructional coaches, the school level champion, and community partners will disappear after year 1 because there will be no more funding. It is difficult to measure the effect of these interventions on student achievement in just one year.

Sub-criterion 3: Community Partner Student Services Contracts on page e52 are dropped into the budget with no discussion in the content narrative regarding their role in the microgrants. Their contracts are ▮▮▮▮▮▮ of the one-year budget which is significant since ▮▮▮▮ will be spent on hardware, broadband, and virtual platforms.

Sub criterion 4: The applicant did not provide the number of persons to be served so the reader is unable to evaluate whether costs are reasonable

Reader's Score: 12

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