

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/20/2020 12:55 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Michigan Department of Education (S425B200025)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Highest Coronavirus Burden</b>		
1. Coronavirus Burden	20	17
<b>Quality of Project Services and Project Plan</b>		
1. Project Services/Plan	35	25
<b>Quality of Management Plan / Adequacy of Resources</b>		
1. Management Plan/Resources	25	21
<b>Sub Total</b>	80	63
<b>Total</b>	80	63

# Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - FY20 REM - 5: 84.425B

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

Applicant: Michigan Department of Education (S425B200025)

## 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 1: High coronavirus burden (17/20 points)

The applicant documents that the state has the 2nd highest unemployment rate in the nation and many coronavirus cases that result in hospitalization and death (e 24). This is a high burden and can make it difficult for students to learn, for teachers to teach, and for families to support students in their learning. Also, the learning hub presented in this project can help alleviate some unemployment because it will create jobs for bus drivers and people who work at the hub to monitor it and keep it clean and to provide technological support at the hub.

The applicant uses reports from Broadband and Student Performance Gaps, the Michigan Moonshot Broadband Framework, and Student and Staff Connectivity Findings to note that they have 500,000 students without a device or internet access to support learning (e21). The state cannot rely on commercial suppliers to build broadband infrastructure in some rural areas of the state because there is not enough money in it for them to make the investment (e23). These problems are very real because students will not be able to access their learning and teachers will not be able to supply the learning without access to the internet and devices.

The applicant discusses the high digital learning gap and that coronavirus has worsened and how it has impacted low income students the most and students in rural areas or small towns because only half of them have high speed internet (e20). The learning gap is also a serious issue that needs to be worked out and not exacerbated.

The applicant highlights that Michigan's coronavirus burden is not fully quantified by the grant's metrics system and that the burden is not born equally in the state. The applicant includes a map detailing broadband access, unemployment, coronavirus cases, and poverty by region (e26). The map and data are helpful to understand how high the burden is from the state's perspective and how the coronavirus is impacting different communities throughout the state.

Due to the high coronavirus burden, the applicant's plan is to give students access to the internet and provide students with high-quality learning models (e14). The proposed project and plan are a direct result of the high coronavirus burden.

#### Weaknesses:

Sub criterion 1: High coronavirus burden (17/20 points)

The application lacked adequate data, details, and descriptions about the ways that the coronavirus burden has impacted teachers and their ability to teach, students and their academics, and the impact that the coronavirus has had on students who are African American, Hispanic, English Language learners (ELL), and/or students with disabilities.

The application lacked additional details about the impact of the coronavirus burden on the community. For example, with the coronavirus, businesses could have taken a hit and not be able to contribute as much as partners to the project because they may not have as many resources to contribute. Alternatively, this may give business people more time to spend with students and the community and maybe they could contribute more of their time to students learning and the project. Also, this project has the potential to make a variety of types of businesses and partners money because they can participate in the project as paid vendors or contractors. The 3P learning model suggested in the project engages students in the community directly with service type project-based learning, place-based learning, and problem solving so this project could impact the businesses hit by coronavirus in a very positive way because students could contribute to hard hit businesses by helping them solve problems for instance or by completing project-based learning at the business sites. Also, the learning hubs needed for internet access and connectivity can create jobs for people in the community as referenced in the strengths section above. The applicant does not tie the project to the unemployment rate in a specific enough way nor does the applicant discuss enough ways the community benefits from the project.

**Reader's Score: 17**

### **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:**

Equal access and treatment for participants who have been underrepresented (4/5 points)

The applicant documents project services and a project plan with an innovative way that they will provide internet access and a learning model for participants from income levels near or below poverty and rural remote areas of the state. (e14, e20, e22-23)

Sub criterion 1: Exceptional approach with Detailed project plan (7/10 points)

The applicant describes an approach where they will create community learning hubs, and develop and deploy innovative 3P learning models statewide (e27). The idea is innovative because the hubs will be built in the community and they can be accessed and used in both the short and the long run as a way for students to access the internet away from school.

The 3P plan will have students engage in community relevant, inter-disciplinary, problem-based, project-based, and place-based learning models as well as increase the number of students interacting and engaging with the learning (e14). The project plan lists a variety of unique types of learning for student engagement.

The plan addresses the value of accessing secure district networks and the safety they provide for students when they are working online (e28).

The applicant begins to explain some research for developing the learning model and the teacher training that goes with it. The application states that MDE will develop professional learning resources to support the implementation of the 3P modules, based on the professional learning standards published by Learning Forward (e29).

The applicant starts to lay out a three-year plan (e31-33) and offers a few measures and benchmarks for the plan and services (e39-40).

Sub criterion 2: Gaps identified and addressed to respond to needs of students (7/10 points)

Internet connectivity gaps are identified as they relate broadly to low-income students living in rural settings. Students do not live close to one another and they do not have access to internet connectivity or the connectivity is not of high quality. Students from low income situations without the internet connectivity need learning hub spots so that they can access their school work remotely. The project aims to establish learning hubs.

The 3P curriculum plan appears to be designed with the needs of diverse learners in mind because it engages students in a variety of curriculum-based learning projects.

Sub criterion 3: Services will expand across remote learning and improve student outcomes (3/5 points)

The applicant provides project services to increase broadband access for learning, student access, student engagement, teacher professional learning participation, implementation of 3P learning experiences, and student achievement (e39-40).

Sub criterion 4: Services reflect up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice (4/5 points)

The applicant has researched and addressed the need for students to use and access a secure network when working remotely. The applicant acknowledges and realizes the need for student protection and security. For instance, the applicant states that student access to the district's secure network is a critical component to this grant program and differentiates this work from free public hotspots. Providing access through district networks ensures ownership and security of data storage, access, and retention. These protections are essential components in ensuring student data privacy and cybersecurity measures that public hotspots do not provide (e28).

The applicant plans to train teachers based on the Research-Supported Early Literacy Coaching Model already in place in Michigan (e30).

**Weaknesses:**

Equal access and treatment for participants who have been underrepresented (4/5 points)

The applicant does not disaggregate the data on low-income students. For instance, the applicant could provide the number of low-income students they serve from diverse social and cultural backgrounds, especially minority, including those who have been traditionally under-represented based race, color, national origin, gender, or disability. The application lacked detail about how the learning model provides equal access and engagement to participants who have been under-represented.

Sub criterion 1: Exceptional approach with Detailed project plan (7/10 points)

The application lacked sufficient details about the 3P learning model and surveys or research conducted in order to know that students would benefit best from this model and the learning it involves during coronavirus and remote learning. Furthermore, the applicant did not clearly state how, based on research, this learning model ties specifically to the needs of the students, their futures, and to the abilities and training that teachers have undergone or will undergo in order to implement the model. The application lacked details about how teachers are ready to incorporate, receive, and accept this model. The applicant needs to provide more assurance about how the 3P learning model ties to state curriculum and more in-depth detail reflecting on how the teachers will be trained. The applicant provides limited discussion regarding why this model specifically will engage students. The applicant lacked research stating that this type of model does in fact engage students and that their lack of participation in online learning does not stem from something other than them not having good broadband connectivity or access to online learning platforms. In other words, there needs to be some type of survey done as to why students are or are not engaging in online learning to begin with.

It is unclear why the hubs are better locations than the schools themselves. For instance, the applicant could lay out a picture of the landscape better and state for instance 90% of students live more than 20 miles away from their host school.

The applicant does not provide exhaustive charts for tracking progress of the plan by year and milestones as they pertain to both student and teacher growth outcomes. It is not enough to simply state that engagement will increase and this will cause learning in Math and ELA.

Sub criterion 2: Gaps identified and addressed to respond to needs of students (7/10 points)

The applicant provides inadequate evidence that they understand the needs of students during coronavirus learning other than the need simply for internet access and devices. The application does not document surveys given to students, teachers, and families about their learning needs and wants as they pertain to learning under the coronavirus burden. The applicant does not refer to research on remote learning to date to address needs of students and their curriculum and factors that engage them in their learning during difficult times.

The applicant provides limited data on how student achievement will be measured, shown, and in relation to groups of under-represented students such as ELL and students with disabilities or race and ethnic groups that have been under served in Math and ELA as a result of this project.

The application provides insufficient discussion about curriculum gaps, reasons for lack of engagement, or teacher training gaps for groups of under-represented students, teachers, or different districts in the state.

Sub criterion 3: Services will expand across remote learning and improve student outcomes (3/5 points)

The applicant provides limited details about student achievement and the implementation of 3P learning experiences in Table 2 on page e40. It is not evident how the project improves student achievement in Math and ELA specifically. The outcomes for the professional development for teachers are not sufficient.

Sub criterion 4: Services reflect up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice (4/5 points)

The application lacked sufficient research about the 3P curriculum model, curriculum, English language learners, change management, teacher training, social emotional learning, student engagement and outside factors that hinder it, online learning, to name a few. If the applicant is using existing research-based frameworks, the applicant did not make a clear connection to them in the application.

**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:**

Strengths:

Sub criterion 1: Plan is on time, within budget with defined responsibilities, timelines, milestones for accomplishing tasks (4/5 points)

The applicant focuses on a three-year timeline for the project and services (e31-33). The timeline makes sense and includes a timeline for rolling out the 3P curriculum model.

The plan includes some defined responsibilities such as: The MDE team will develop a protocol for project specific data collection, triangulation, analysis, and mapping to ensure that data quality and appropriate methodology are used for strategic selection of community learning hubs. The MDE team will develop a comprehensive implementation plan that will include learning hub selection, communication strategies, evaluation plans, key partner roles and responsibilities, and execution of deliverables (e34).

The applicant includes details about the responsibilities of one of the community partners. For instance, the applicant identifies Michigan Virtual Learning Continuity Work Group. The work group encompasses a cross-section of leaders with expertise to assist school districts in transitioning to new models of instruction. The expert panel supports three critical functions for Michigan: 1) react to potential ideas, policies, and guidance for school leaders and policymakers around remote and online learning, access, and equity issues; 2) identify and create recommended strategies for leaders to consider as they implement remote and online learning; and 3) explore new scalable delivery models that enable effective any time, any place, and any pace teaching and learning (e36-37).

Sub criterion 2: Proposed funds will support project (4/5 points)

The applicant organizes the budget by category and amount so that it is clear who is receiving the personnel, fringe, travel, and supplies money and why. Also, the applicant breaks down the majority of the spending which is contractual in a mostly comprehensive manner.

Sub criterion 3: Costs are reasonable in relation to objectives, design, and significance of project (4/5 points)

The applicant provides some reasonable costs in relation to the significance of the project. For instance, the applicant

proposes the majority of the spend goes to contractual spend as noted in line budget item 6, [REDACTED] contractual spend (e6) and the applicant does include a breakdown of the spend from this line item and the spend does appear to make sense overall given the design and significance of the project.

Sub criterion 4: Costs are reasonable in relation to number of people served and anticipated results (9/10 points)

The outcome of this project is justified because it can increase student achievement by giving 500,000 students access to broadband and increasing their participation in an engaging learning model, all while including community partners, teachers and families for a mere [REDACTED] per student.

The applicant anticipates they will have systematic data sets regarding the number of students provided access through the community learning hubs, the number of students who use that access, the amount of time spent on the network, and the implementation of 3P learning in this service plan and project (e31). In this way, it makes sense to spend the money because the student outcomes are starting to show.

#### **Weaknesses:**

Sub criterion 1: Plan is on time, within budget with defined responsibilities, timelines, milestones for accomplishing tasks (4/5 points)

The application lacked milestones for accomplishing and monitoring tasks for all the components and players in the project plan. For instance, the applicant could include a comprehensive Gantt chart for the project to showcase milestones, tasks and a timeline along with members or teams who are responsible for completing all the tasks. The applicant does not include ways they intend to track and monitor the tasks accomplished by the MDE team during different phases of the project. Furthermore, the applicant provides limited discussion about the community partners and how their tasks fall in line with the budget of the project specifically. The plan does not provide enough details about roles and milestones met by each member of the grant team that is being paid out of the personnel and fringe benefits budget lines. The goal of all this is increasing student learning and outcomes and these also need to be monitored and tracked better. It is too hard to tell if and when students will meet a variety of learning outcomes in the 3P model so that they can read and do math better.

Sub criterion 2: Proposed funds will support project (4/5 points)

The contractor administration and community collaboration components of the budget and how they are supporting the project need to be documented more closely and precisely in the application. It seems like the funds support the project overall but it is not entirely clear how this is being done or how the money is being used. Furthermore, it is a bit confusing to have community collaboration listed twice in the budget on page e91 and again on page e92. It is ambiguous and hard to understand exactly what this money is being spent on. In addition, the applicant does not clearly define what the \$250,000 in contract administration is being used for and to whom it is going. This is also missing from the narrative portion of the application.

Sub criterion 3: Costs are reasonable in relation to objectives, design, and significance of project (4/5 points)

It does not seem like a large enough portion of the contractual spend is being used on the expansion of innovative learning models component of the plan and it seems a disproportionate amount of money is being spent on increasing access to internet and school networks. In addition, the applicant may want to consider fully funding a couple positions in personnel as opposed to partially funding five positions. If the partial funding from the other source gets cut for instance, then the entire grant team will be compromised. It is unclear why on page e6 the contractual spend goes from [REDACTED] in year 1, to [REDACTED] in year 2, to [REDACTED] in year 3 of the plan.

Sub criterion 4: Costs are reasonable in relation to number of people served and anticipated results (9/10 points)

The applicant does not lay out the roles of the community partners clearly and how this community collaboration piece would impact them in a positive financial way and how the relationship between them and this project would also benefit

student learning and showcase positive growth for students. The costs of [REDACTED] per student become even more reasonable when the impact financial and otherwise that the project will have on community members in the communities where students live in included.

The application does not have sufficient measures and milestones to track some important student learning outcomes as a result of this project. While the students are clearly able to access the internet better as a result of spending this money, it is still not clear that they will actually attain the growth in Math and Reading if we spend the money on the 3P program because this needs to be tracked and monitored more closely with more milestones and attainment tasks that pertain to student growth.

**Reader's Score:** 21

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 07/20/2020 12:55 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/20/2020 12:55 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Michigan Department of Education (S425B200025)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Highest Coronavirus Burden</b>		
1. Coronavirus Burden	20	17
<b>Quality of Project Services and Project Plan</b>		
1. Project Services/Plan	35	21
<b>Quality of Management Plan / Adequacy of Resources</b>		
1. Management Plan/Resources	25	17
<b>Sub Total</b>	80	55
<b>Total</b>	80	55

# Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - FY20 REM - 5: 84.425B

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

Applicant: Michigan Department of Education (S425B200025)

## 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 provided up to date data regarding the Coronavirus's impact on its state. "MI ranks 2nd in death rates, 6th in total deaths, 9th in total cases, and 10th in total tests provided" (Page e24).
- "The State's unemployment rate rose to 22.7% in April 2020" (Page e25).
- Table 1 on Page e26 provided helpful and specific data regarding the Coronavirus burden on the state. This chart and the related data are important because they not only highlight the burden these regions are facing but also how the Coronavirus may exacerbate burdens in already struggling regions. Additionally, the applicant can use this data to identify locations, based on the greatest need, for the proposed digital learning hubs as proposed throughout the application.

#### Weaknesses:

- The applicant could have provided additional academic and school-district based data regarding the Coronavirus burden. Specifically, it would have been helpful if the applicant quantified loss of student learning, updates on state testing from 2019-2020, anticipated budget cuts and related information pertaining to the burden experienced as a result of the Coronavirus.
- The applicant also did not provide extensive information on students with special needs, English language learners. Including this data would help identify additional supports and services required to serve each student subgroup. Further, the applicant could use this data to ensure they are being data-drive and proactive with their approach.

Reader's Score: 17

### 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:**

Strengths:

Equal access & treatment/Quality of project services and project plan –The applicant provides insights on how it plans to ensure equal access and treatment for underrepresented groups. Demographic information about the number of districts and LEAs across the state was provided as well as survey data estimating that 500,000 students lack sufficient internet/broadband access, a large majority of these students living in rural and/or low-income communities (Page e22). This information as well as the applicants plan to use leverage learning hubs and other suggestions shows they are attempting to ensure equal access to underrepresented groups. 3 points.

(1) – The applicant described how the community learning hubs and 3P learning models would be used to address the absolute priority. The community learning hubs and 3P learning models will allow for differentiation at the community level, if done appropriately (Page e10). The plan also calls for collaborating with experienced educators to help develop curriculum and professional learning opportunities. The benefit of using experienced, and hopefully highly effective educators, is multi-faceted. First, it creates buy-in from teachers that have years of experience and insight from working directly with students and families. Second, their insights can be leveraged to develop curriculum and professional learning communities that are aligned to their needs. Lastly, the success of this approach will largely be due to the day to day actions of educators. Seeking their input and expertise early in the initiative is a promising practice. 6 points

(2) – The applicant plans to use student participation data and analysis to determine gaps in services and opportunities to improve (Page e31). They also did a good job analyzing the gaps and lack of internet access as well as the proposed plan to close those gaps. – 6 points

(3) – It is likely that that the proposed services will expand access to remote learning options in the selected districts. The two key solutions and partnerships will help the selected districts with support and expansion of resources that they would normally not have access to (Page e29). 3 points

(4) – The applicant provided some mention of up to date services and knowledge that reflect effective practice (Page e30) – 3 points

### **Weaknesses:**

Equal access and treatment/Quality of project services and project plan: The applicant should consider including additional detail regarding how it will work with each of the selected communities to best understand their needs as the project is being implemented. Further, the table provided on page e26 displays levels of poverty for each region but does not show income levels, race, or academic achievement data. This additional information would prove useful to ensure that the aforementioned strategies support equal access for all students.

(1) The applicant did not provide any sort of Gantt Chart or detailed project plan to provide an understanding of how it would address the absolute priority. This information would be valuable in understanding the proposed action steps, timelines, and other critical needs to ensure the success of this plan.

(2) – The applicant did not provide benchmark data or any framework to display progress in improving gaps or weaknesses in the aforementioned areas. Further, it would have been helpful to understand the applicant's goals for each

year and how progress would be measured towards those goals.

(3) – The applicant did not provide substantial evidence or plans displaying how an increase in student outcomes would be realized. Core content development and professional development opportunities are mentioned yet the applicant lacks specific information and benchmark data related to academic achievement. It would be helpful to understand how the plan would be implemented and how student achievement will increase as a result of the plan.

(4) – The applicant only cited one research article within the application and few more on the references page (Page e42). It would have been beneficial for the applicant to cite additional research related to up to date practices. Additional information, research, and best practices regarding distance learning, academic achievement, and how curriculum will be implemented on these platforms.

**Reader's Score: 21**

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

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

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

- (1) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks. (up to 5 points)**
- (2) The extent to which the proposed use of funds will adequately support the proposed project. (up to 5 points)**
- (3) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project. (up to 5 points)**
- (4) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the number of persons to be served and to the anticipated results and benefits. (up to 10 points)**

#### **Strengths:**

- (1) – The management plan includes timelines and milestones for each project task (Page e39). The suggested targets are quantifiable and measurable. – 3 points
- (2) - The applicant's indirect cost rate is 10.60% and the proposed funds appear to adequately support the proposed project (Page e6). Also, the additional information found in the budget narrative (Page e90) was helpful as it outlined specific cost information for employees and core aspects of the model – 4 points
- (3) – The costs appear reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project – 3 points
- (4) – The costs are reasonable in relation to the number of persons served and anticipated results, approximately 500,000 students across the selected regions (Page e30). The applicant also explained a process and plan to assess progress and evaluate their approach throughout. – 7 points

#### **Weaknesses:**

- (1) – The logic model lacked details and specific goals. Additional information in this model would be helpful to understand how the applicant will use it as an actionable tool throughout the grant (Page e88). The management plan does not identify responsible parties for each measure and major task throughout the plan (Page e39).
- (2) – It would be helpful for the applicant to provide additional cost information regarding budget categories 6 and 8. Budget category 6, Contractual, grows from █████ in Y1 to █████ in Y3. Budget category 8, Other, remains constant for all three years of the proposed grant.
- (3) – Again, additional cost information regarding the two aforementioned line items would be helpful to determine the

reasonability of this projected plan. Specifically, it seems that salaries may be low given the amount of staff they are trying to fund. Also, \$100,000 does not seem sufficient for evaluation for a project of this magnitude. (Page e90)  
(4) – The applicant cited community collaboration in the budget twice and the roles or costs related to each role/organization are not clearly defined. It would be helpful for the applicant to be more specific regarding how these funds will be used.

**Reader's Score:** 17

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 07/20/2020 12:55 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/20/2020 12:55 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Michigan Department of Education (S425B200025)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Highest Coronavirus Burden</b>		
1. Coronavirus Burden	20	18
<b>Quality of Project Services and Project Plan</b>		
1. Project Services/Plan	35	22
<b>Quality of Management Plan / Adequacy of Resources</b>		
1. Management Plan/Resources	25	18
<b>Sub Total</b>	80	58
<b>Total</b>	80	58

# Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - FY20 REM - 5: 84.425B

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

Applicant: Michigan Department of Education (S425B200025)

## 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 response was well-developed in that it included multiple examples and relevant information of the state's coronavirus burden and how Michigan has been impacted by the coronavirus. For example, the response stated that Michigan ranked 2nd in death rates at 9.1 percent as calculated by the CDC, ranked 6th in total deaths, 9th in total cases, and 10th in total tests provided. The response stated that Michigan's unemployment rate was second in the nation (p. e24). As of June 17, Michigan has had 60,064 confirmed cases and 5,772 deaths from COVID-19 and unemployment of 22.7% (p. e25). The figure included on p. e26 demonstrated convincing data about the state's coronavirus burden among varying regions. This information is important to be able to execute the plan because it accounts for the difference of impact in regions across the state. The regional analysis of the percentage of the population without broadband access is fundamental to the success of the plan. Such analysis will provide key information to guide the location and amount of learning hubs across the state. Michigan is in the 41st to 60th percentile as calculated for the ESF-REM grant competition.

#### Weaknesses:

The applicant's plan to target rural students is evident and well defined. However, the application would be strengthened if it addressed and accounted for the urban students in the state to provide a full picture of all students. Furthermore, the accounted for rural student population does not detail further demographic makeup which is important to account for additional supports and services that might be beneficial to provide. Additionally, the state's coronavirus burden is evident in the response, however portrayal would have been more extensive had it included context of student learning and impact on teachers.

Reader's Score: 18

### 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:**

(Equal access and treatment)

The application included a statement for Section 427 of GEPA that documented applicant's plans for removing barriers and ensuring equity. The statement named specific underrepresented groups and connected the teaching, technology, and professional development supports that will be provided.

(p. e10). (4 points)

(1) The response addresses specific needs pertaining to accessing high-quality remote learning opportunities by providing a multidimensional approach including access to internet, devices, and trained teachers and student outcomes. The response details that during 2019-2020 school closure there were varying levels of preparedness to adapt to distance learning across school districts due to lack of devices, connectivity, or readiness of educators to teach remotely. As part of the plan to create learning hubs and implement a statewide learning model, the applicant describes how it will draw on strong community resources through community partners. The proposal is aligned with EUP Connect Project to integrate a broadband network that will provide services to every home, business, and institution in the tri-county area. A strength of the plan is the use of the School District Network because it is a creative method to provide access while ensuring security and privacy. This approach is exceptional during a time when many schools have faced technical problems due to malware attacks and other security issues. (5 points)

(2) Response includes cited analysis of a statewide survey to identify the number of students who lacked access to internet-capable devices, internet access, or both. This analysis found that 29.8% of students did not have a device at home and 28.6% did not have internet access that could support learning at a distance. Response addresses high areas of need and proposes a plan in alignment with creating more access to devices and internet (p. e.31).

Applicant identified the proximity to learning hubs as a barrier and has included allocated resources to provide transportation for students to be allowed access to the learning hubs such as fuel for school buses and/or payments to bus drivers due to additional routes that support alternative schedules, public transportation cards or subsidies, and other supports (p. e. 28). This demonstrates planning for ensuring students will ultimately be able to access learning hubs. Applicant will continue to use data to ensure that the learning hubs exist in communities with the greatest need. Applicant made strong connection between accessibility through School District Network and how this will ensure student privacy and safety. This is a reasonable connection and area of need in the virtual learning space. (7 points)

(3) The response demonstrated clear strength because the 3P unites will be aligned to Michigan content standards, online learning standards, and quality education best practices. This demonstrates continuity and building off already established successes. The applicant detailed that educators will receive professional learning to ensure strong implementation of the 3P Learning model. Additionally, the plan is likely to expand access because of the strength in collaboration with experienced curriculum developers, current classroom educators, and other statewide partners. It is clear that the applicant plans to allow for best practices and continuous learning as demonstrated by the 3P learning model integration into the MiStrategyBank (MSB), (p. e29). (3 points)

(4) Response references one cited article and links to websites including the Research Supported Early Literacy Coaching Model that the state is currently using (p. e. 29).

(3 points)

**Weaknesses:**

(Equal access and treatment)

The application included a GEPA statement that acknowledged and named several underrepresented groups. The application would be strengthened if it incorporated demographic breakdown by race and income level. Such a framework will enhance access and treatment while allowing greater differentiation in meeting various student needs. Commitment to access and treatment would be more convincing if woven throughout the plan and narrative, not solely limited to the GEPA statement.

(1) The plan to create learning hubs, implement the 3P learning model, and use community resources through partnership is a comprehensive approach; however, the details of these separate components are not clearly detailed. Many of the targets listed in the table on page e39 and e40 have an overall end goal, but lack end of year goals broken down by the three-year time period. Use of community partners are stated throughout the application, but it is not specified what specific role they will play in the implementation process. The student achievement and student engagement targets would be made stronger if there was a more detailed analysis of the current data related to those metrics. Additionally, the plan would be strengthened if it was detailed responsive actions should percentages not improve within the first phase of the program.

(2) It is clear that the plan to provide internet access and learning hubs will meet the identified need of connectivity access so that students can learn remotely. However, the proposed plan falls short in ensuring that learning will happen and improve once connectivity is provided. The plan would be strengthened if it included additional assurances related to student engagement with learning hubs and model and goals for student academic outcomes. The targets included on e39-40 “75 percent of participating students report satisfaction with the 3P learning model” does not incorporate a year to year target goal. The student achievement “increase mathematics, ela, and benchmark scores by 5 percentage points” has a broad 3-year completion but should be further broken down from year to year for each subject and grade level. For related reasons the application lacks fully convincing data that the learning hubs and 3P model will not only provide access and engagement, but improved outcomes in reading and math.

(3) Applicant did not provide data about current success rates of the models that they are modeling 3P after. There is a lack of clarity as to why the 3P learning model approach was selected and the student achievement related to such model. Response did not detail assurance that access to broadband and internet at community learning hubs will lead to improved learning outcomes. Connectivity and access are important steps; however, it is not clear what the quality of instruction provided will be. It is not detailed what type of professional development will be provided to ensure high quality instruction.

(4) Response made some connections and alignment to proposed plan, how it will be carried out, and subsequent impact. The response did not provide substantial research. Plan would be strengthened if more connections were made between research on the learning model and community partnership learning hubs. It would be beneficial to provide more information and research on effectiveness of the existing framework for the 3P model.

**Reader's Score: 22**

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

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

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

- (1) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks. (up to 5 points)**
- (2) The extent to which the proposed use of funds will adequately support the proposed project. (up to 5 points)**
- (3) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project. (up to 5 points)**
- (4) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the number of persons to be served and to the anticipated results and benefits. (up to 10 points)**

**Strengths:**

- (1) The management plan includes measures related to all aspects of the plan (first column on page e39 and e40). It is difficult to determine if the proposed plan can be achieved on time because (1) there is a lack of baseline data to determine if the target objectives are reasonable, and (2) the targets are not broken down into yearly measures. The staffing model includes several positions such as project lead, managers, and specialists to support implementation. (3 points)
- (2) The proposed budget aligns with plans, but it is not entirely convincing due to lack of detail in budget narrative and logic model. (3 points).
- (3) Applicant provides a budget narrative that details categories that are aligned with the plan and have seemingly reasonable costs. It is difficult to be certain because subcategories are not matched to the year to year breakdown estimates stated in the budget spreadsheet. (4 points)
- (4) Response states that the regions served will represent the greatest need and allow for understanding of how the model can work in a variety of local contexts. Objective states that goal of serving 500,000 students currently without sufficient connectivity. Three-year budget of [REDACTED]. Serving that number of students at the total cost is reasonable. (8 points)

**Weaknesses:**

- (1) Response somewhat details the specifics of each position and the timeline objectives associated with the positions, but added detail would provide more clarity (p.e.88)
- (2) In the budget narrative for contractual services described as “Expand Innovative Learning Models” it would add better clarity if the three categories within each were further broken down by cost and from year to year. This section of the budget includes funds for lessons, professional learning, and community collaboration. The lessons and professional learning components are crucial for success of the plan because the select units need to yield the targeted student achievement improvements, and the professional learnings are necessary so that educators can properly instruct on units. Community collaboration is essential for ensuring family are engaged and aware of remote instruction. Further breakdown of the costs for each of these categories would better determine adequacy of plan.
- (3) Applicant provides a budget narrative that details categories that are aligned with the plan and have seemingly reasonable costs. It is difficult to be certain because subcategories are not matched divided by the year to year breakdown estimates stated in the budget spreadsheet.
- (4) Application has a demonstrated strength in the ties to community partners and relations. However, it is not clear what specific duties and responsibilities the community partners will have. Lack of clarity on the role and position can lead to difficulties in effectively measuring progress. The inclusion of teachers will spur implementation fidelity, but it is important that teachers are properly trained and aligned on current student achievement and incremental progress goals.

**Reader's Score:** 18

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 07/20/2020 12:55 PM