

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/22/2020 09:46 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Oklahoma State Department of Education (S425B200029)

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	19
Quality of Management Plan / Adequacy of Resources		
1. Management Plan/Resources	25	19
Sub Total	80	53
Total	80	53

Technical Review Form

Panel #9 - FY20 REM - 9: 84.425B

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Oklahoma State Department of Education (S425B200029)

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 some support of the economic and student academic impact of the coronavirus on the state. For example, the applicant provided data that there had been 478 cases recorded for one day, June 21, which is its highest one day report since the outbreak occurred. Online survey results indicated financial burden on residents that included 36.2% missed a rent or mortgage payment, and 46.7% experienced at least one family having a loss of income since March. The applicant clearly stated and discussed that per 2,000 teachers surveyed, the coronavirus required schools to be closed who in turn struggled with remote delivery of content to students (pp. 3-7).

Weaknesses:

In the discussion by the applicant of the impact of the coronavirus on the state, a clear identification of indicators used to support a high burden was not evident. There was an inadequate discussion of statewide impact to support a high burden. The research data discussed was not specific to the state, but a national research relating to the impact on student achievement. The applicant did not discuss the impact the coronavirus had on students and parents who suddenly moved from in-person school to online remote education (pp. 3-7).

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:

Quality and sufficiency of strategies for ensuring equal access: No strengths found. 0 points

1) The applicant clearly outlined its plan to address Absolute Priority 3 by providing teachers and parents with professional development to build the necessary skills to deliver standard content in-person or online effectively. The applicant provided strong support for the use of performance-based assessments, which are adequate to determine where students are in their learning. The proposed project would incorporate teacher-created assessments in a performance management system to track teachers and student performance, thereby tracking the increased knowledge of teachers in delivering content remotely as well as student learning. For example, the professional development to be provided in the proposed project includes training on performance-based assessments where participants would learn to create and evaluate assessments to target student needs with classroom instruction delivered in-person or on an online format. Academic support with distance learning would be provided to students. The applicant included a letter of support from the Governor of the state as documentation of support of the proposed project and describes financial support from stimulus funding such as providing technology to students/families to access online project services (pp. 8-13). 7 points

2) The applicant focused on two areas of gaps or weaknesses that impact students that would be addressed by the proposed project. Support for remote learning, paraprofessional support to teachers, and social and emotional learning would need to address the added stresses brought on by the coronavirus on students who already have a high number of stressful or traumatic events. The applicant clearly indicated that one in five of its teachers were teaching under an emergency certificate which does not provide the same formal training path to certification. For example, the applicant indicated that the Oklahoma Department of Health report showed Oklahoma children ranked #1 in having high Adverse Childhood Experiences scores and the resulting impacts on mental health, therefore social and emotional learning (SEL) strategies would be included in the proposed project (pp. 18-20). 6 points

3) The plan described by the applicant would likely increase remote options through the professional development to be delivered to teachers and principals. The applicant plans to contract with vendors to create the delivery platforms for the performance assessments and SEL lessons to be developed and delivered by school districts which could have a positive impact on student outcomes. (pp. 9-11). 3 points

4) The applicant cited some research that specifically addressed the components in the proposed project that were relevant to support inclusion of performance assessments, social and emotional learning, and the importance of paraprofessionals in the delivery and support of improving student academic achievement and social behaviors. For example, the applicant cited Durlak, et.al, 2011 research related to social and emotional learning strategies that resulted in an increase in academic improvement and a reduction in stress and depression in students (pp. 21-22). 3 points

Weaknesses:

Quality and sufficiency of strategies for ensuring equal access: The applicant did not address or provide assurance of equal access and treatment of eligible participants to ensure participation in the proposed project by members of groups traditionally underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability.

1) The approach to Absolute Priority 3 by the applicant is not exceptional from the discussion provided the applicant. The applicant's current teacher shortage that the proposed project would focus on through the development of a paraprofessional program for parents does not address increasing remote learning or options for students and parents (pp. 8-13).

2) The applicant did not connect the shortage of certified teachers to the impact of the coronavirus on education or any information to provide a clear discussion of how this issue impacted students. The parent pro program would not be provided to all parents and the applicant did not discuss what other training would be provided to ensure parents had the support they needed to support distance learning options for students (pp. 18-20).

3) The applicant proposed project does not have a strong focus on increasing remote options for students and parents. The educational model discussed by the applicant was more focused on in-person delivery of classroom instruction and lacks the supports parents and students would need for remote learning (pp. 9-11).

4) Some of the research provided did not connect to the proposed project or was not discussed, such as the impact of the coronavirus on students who identified living in low-income or Black communities within the state (pp. 21-22).

Reader's Score: 19

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 clearly identified the members of the management team and their responsibilities related to implementing the proposed project. Also included are relevant milestones that would be utilized to monitor and determine completion of the tasks that include full-time project manager, project coordinator to be hired, two distance learning specialists, and two college specialists to be hired to assist parents with enrollment in the parent pro program. Resumes of all personnel were included and qualifications were discussed that aligned with responsibilities (pp. 23-25). 3 points

2) The applicant provided adequate discussion regarding the use of funds and how the funds requested would support the implementation of the proposed project. For example, funds were budgeted to cover appropriate personnel and needed travel, a small amount for supplies, contractual services to cover the development of the online and SEL apps, and an external evaluator for the proposed project (pp. e62-e64 Budget Narrative). 5 points

3) The costs projected for the project services to be provided that include the professional development for teachers, principals, and parents are reasonable to implement the proposed project, as designed, to effectively support delivery of content via the apps and platforms to be created for use remotely and in-person. The applicant provided clear justification for budgeted items, as they relate to the proposed project (pp. e62-e64 Budget Narrative). 5 points

4) The applicant requested [REDACTED] dollars over a three-year grant period to serve 1,200 teachers, 300 parents in the parent pro program, and to impact 703,650 students to support distance learning and in-person delivery of course materials. These requested amounts are reasonable in relation to the amount of intended people served. The applicant

indicated that the cost analysis would be [REDACTED] per participant, per year, to implement and evaluate services (p. 26). 8 points

Weaknesses:

1) The applicant did not provide a timeline that would cover the full grant period. The applicant did not clearly discuss how goal 2 which is to increase the teacher workforce through its underlying objectives that created the parent pro program would be met, since no supporting documentation was provided that indicates that once parents complete the parent pro program, that they would seek teacher certification within five years and teach (pp. 12-14, 25-26).

4) The applicant did not indicate the approximate number of parents that would receive training from the proposed project to support learning at home if they were not selected to participate in the parent pro program. The type of support that would be provided to this group of parents to prepare and support them with the remote learning to be delivered from the platform to be created by the proposed project was not evident (pp. e62-e64 Budget Narrative).

Reader's Score: 19

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/22/2020 09:46 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/22/2020 09:46 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Oklahoma State Department of Education (S425B200029)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Highest Coronavirus Burden		
1. Coronavirus Burden	20	17
Quality of Project Services and Project Plan		
1. Project Services/Plan	35	18
Quality of Management Plan / Adequacy of Resources		
1. Management Plan/Resources	25	20
Sub Total	80	55
Total	80	55

Technical Review Form

Panel #9 - FY20 REM - 9: 84.425B

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Oklahoma State Department of Education (S425B200029)

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 notes that according to the US Census House Pulse Survey, conducted in May 2020, t 36.2% of participants report missing the last month's mortgage or rent payment, and nearly half of all homes surveyed indicated that someone in their home had lost wages since March 13 (p. 3). The applicant also notes that cases of COVID have been increasing throughout the month of June, in spite of a decrease in the rates of tests being administered (p. e20). 17 points

Weaknesses:

The application does not make it clear how COVID-19 has impacted access to resources, technology, etc. especially for students. This section would have been stronger with more specific details on how students are struggling (p e22-e23) in relation/response to COVID-19. -3 points

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:

Quality and sufficiency of strategies for ensuring equal access: No strengths noted. 0 points

Sub-criterion 1: The applicant outlines an ambitious and novel plan, which includes training parents as paraprofessionals, in a program the applicant is calling Parent-Para (p. 8-9). This plan would involve having parents complete training to serve as paraprofessionals, earn an Associate's degree, be sponsored by a district superintendent, and receive an offer of employment upon completion of their para-professional credentialing. This plan is particularly exciting and responsive, given the teacher shortage in the state, coupled with evidence that inclusion of parents in educational systems is associated with higher student performance. Moreover, this plan would help alleviate some of the unemployment stressors currently at play in Oklahoma communities. This would be offered state-wide, so would include broad reach as well. 6 points

Sub-criterion 2: The applicant does plan to address gaps in the teaching force within the state, by working to train parents as paraprofessionals and provide support to classroom teachers (p. 8-9). The focus on parents-as-paras is designed to help improve with the number of qualified instructional staff, which is currently very low in Oklahoma. Currently, one in five teachers in OK is on an "emergency" certification and lacks training from a teacher education program (p. 8). 6 points

Sub-criterion 3: The applicant indicates that Governor Stitt of Oklahoma, as well as the state department of education, have already invested heavily in increased remote access, and the OK to Learn project would provide funds to leverage, as well as expand, this investment (p. 20) in order to improve remote teaching and learning. For example, the funds awarded under this opportunity would allow the state to offer more training opportunities to build teacher's remote teaching skills. 3 points

Sub-criterion 4: The applicant provides some evidence in support of the planned work (p. e38-e39) such as McTighe's 2014 study of performance tasks. Additionally, a strong focus on social emotional learning (SEL) in the project plan in response to the current rates of mental health challenges in the state's schools (p. 15-16) is a strength for this sub-criterion. This focus on SEL reflects up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice. The project plan includes the development of an SEL digital platform that would house lessons with a focus on SEL components (e.g., social and relationship skills) for all K-12 students in the state (p. 16). 3 points

Weaknesses:

Quality and sufficiency of strategies for ensuring equal access: The applicant does not provide evidence of strategies aligned with the GEPA requirements. There is no detail in the narrative to indicate that the project will be designed to meet the needs of traditionally underrepresented groups. -5 points

Sub-criterion 1: The applicant does not provide sufficient evidence for how the project will successfully meet the demands of remote teaching and learning. For example, on page 12, the applicant says that teachers will leverage software, but it is not clear what this software is, whether it is already developed, or which features. -4 points

Sub-criterion 2: The gaps and weaknesses identified (e.g., low academic performance, rural community challenges) are not clearly mapped onto the plan for a remote learning environment. There is insufficient evidence for how the grant will support this remote work plan and whether this plan is related to the COVID crisis. -4 points

Sub-criterion 3: The details given on the planned work to address challenges related to remote teaching and learning (e.g., p. 12) do not present a robust plan for expanding remote access and improving outcomes. The remote options outlined are not robust. The applicant states that funds from this award would allow for expansion of remote teaching, but details on which steps will be taken, when, and by whom, are lacking. -2 points

Sub-criterion 4: The applicant does not cite relevant research for each of the major components of the work plan. For example, on pages e38-e39, the Hattie citation (Hattie, 2002) does not appear to be relevant or directly related to the work outlined. This section could have been strengthened by more evidence of how to support rural communities' teaching and more specifically--learning. In addition, given that the parent-para component is such a large part of this plan, evidence of improved outcomes for students when parents are in classrooms is warranted, but not provided. -2 points

Reader's Score: 18

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 outlines a detailed project plan (p. 23-25), identifying which positions will be required, what the job descriptions are for those positions, necessary qualifications, and the timeline for hiring and training. In addition, the applicant offers a project timeline outlining major milestones (p. 25). 2 points

Sub-criterion 2: The budget is sufficient for the activities proposed, and the budget narrative is clear with regard to which funds will be allocated for which activities and personnel. The costs are reasonable for scope of work, persons to be served, and number/duration of activities outlined (p. e65-e66). For example, the funds requested for a full-time project manager (██████████ per year) is a reasonable request. In addition, the in-state travel costs requested (██████████ per year) seem reasonable given the size of the state and the number of remote districts to be served. 5 points

Sub-criterion 3: Budget details offer evidence that the budget is sufficient to complete the planned work, and all costs are reasonable (p. e65-e66). The budget includes reasonable funds for personnel, materials (e.g., computers, office space, phones, and printers), travel, and teacher training stipends (p. e65-e66). 5 points

Sub-criterion 4: Budget details (p. e65-e66) offer evidence that the project team should be able to successfully offer training for the number of persons planned (e.g., parents as paras). Funding is requested for a project manager, project coordinator (to manage logistics and administrative tasks), and distance learning specialists. The applicant worked to develop a budget that would allow sufficient personnel for completing the work plan. 8 points

Weaknesses:

Sub-criterion 1: Goal 2 (increase workforce, p. 9) in the objectives is not directly aligned with the focus on remote learning, which is critical to this funding opportunity. This objective would have been strengthened if the applicant had made clear how this particular increase in the workforce is a) required as a response to COVID and b) will specifically address the challenges associated with remote teaching and learning. - 3 points

Sub-criterion 2: No weaknesses noted.

Sub-criterion 3: No weaknesses noted.

Sub-criterion 4: Because the applicant cannot be confident that these parents will successfully make the transition to classroom teachers, the heavy investment in this project component is questionable.
- 2 points

Reader's Score: 20

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/22/2020 09:46 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/22/2020 09:46 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Oklahoma State Department of Education (S425B200029)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Highest Coronavirus Burden		
1. Coronavirus Burden	20	14
Quality of Project Services and Project Plan		
1. Project Services/Plan	35	17
Quality of Management Plan / Adequacy of Resources		
1. Management Plan/Resources	25	16
Sub Total	80	47
Total	80	47

Technical Review Form

Panel #9 - FY20 REM - 9: 84.425B

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Oklahoma State Department of Education (S425B200029)

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 describes the approach for the project to provide students with academic and social emotional support, distance learning professional development for teachers, and parental skill programs, which became necessary because of the COVID -19 crisis. The challenges revealed from the impact surveys results, indicates that the virus impacts household finances; loss of employment; lack of food; and spikes in new virus cases. The survey results validates that the COVID-19 crisis also has an impact on student learning; teachers inability to adapt to online platform teaching; and parents struggling with children at home, as well as engaging them in learning, which dictates a need for funding. (pgs. 3-6) 14 pts.

Weaknesses:

The applicant providing additional COVID-19 burden indicators would have further validated the need for additional funding and assistance in implementing a remote-learning environment, such as, lack of broadband and Wi-Fi access, health challenges, or technology teaching skills for teachers. (pgs. 2-3)

Reader's Score: 14

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:

Quality and sufficiency of strategies for ensuring equal access:

No Strengths noted. 0 pts.

1. The applicant contends that funding will expand access and services with academic support to students in grades K-12. The program outcomes are expected to produce a higher quality learning environment in the classroom or a distance learning setting. The intent of the applicant is to ensure that all students have devices and connectivity and to then build a remote learning option for the students. The applicant provided details focus on innovative plans for the remote learning education model; engaging families in online learning activities that align with state standards; expanded special education content materials; and a three-year professional learning program. These components include extensive strategies that can address and deliver promising results for the proposed project. (pgs. 20-21, e30) 6 pts.

2. The applicant specifies gaps and weaknesses that relate to a high percentage of the targeted population of students having low academic performance, living in small, rural communities, and score below state proficiency requirements. The applicant references the lack of certified teachers in the state and mental health disparities as gaps that also affects the targeted population of students. The gaps and weaknesses identified by the applicant have increased during the COVID-19 crisis and will be addressed through identified strategies for effective online learning. (pgs. 16-18) 4 pts.

3. The applicant outlines multiple new remote learning options that are available to support teachers and parents, and to improve student outcomes. There are several areas of focus, such as, a competency-based education trial; professional learning program; engagement of parents, and students managing their own pathways. The benefits of new strategies for remote learning are expected to improve outcomes for students and their families by the end of the grant period. (pgs. 12-14) 2 pts.

4. The applicant presents research and practices that reflect systemic disparities in the targeted areas of education, economic, and health conditions. The services that are provided in the plan align with current research that deals with particular factors, such as, student outcomes; dealing with technological limitations; and developing a supportive working environment for teachers. The applicant outlines evidence in the plan that validates essential project concepts that are aligned with relevant research and effective practices to support students, parents, and teachers. (pg. 22) 5 pts.

Weaknesses:

Quality and sufficiency of strategies for ensuring equal access:

The applicant provides no evidential strategies that align with GEPA requirements for ensuring equal access to project services for eligible participants, including students with disabilities. The applicant lacks details and specifics that ensure that the project will attract persons who are members of groups that have been traditionally underrepresented.

1. The applicant provides incompatible specifics to validate details relating to the implementation of project services, activities, and resources that can be shared on remote online platforms. The education model including curriculum resources, instructional content, and professional development--described in the plan--lacks adequate support for students learning remotely or to ensure improved student outcomes. The focus to increase the teacher workforce is not a

guarantee to provide substantial support to the students and parents.

The applicant lacks a clear explanation of why and how the hiring of vendors can provide academic project-based activities, and effectively support students on a phone application or the internet or, can produce effective student outcomes. It is also not clear how a vendor developing a social emotional learning digital platform, with input from counseling staff, can actually engage students and produce effective outcomes.

2. The applicant presents gaps and weaknesses, but they show no correlation or alignment with services, infrastructure, or opportunities relating to students in a remote learning environment.

3. The plan lacks a relevant explanation of how the described project is comprehensive and will create effective teaching and learning in a remote learning environment for students with disabilities, such as, distance learning instruction; performance-based assessment training; paraprofessional teacher training; enhanced leadership skills; and Cohort Learning. The applicant did not present an educational model approach focusing on a remote learning environment to accommodate all of the targeted population of students, teachers, and families, however, the one presented seems to be for a regular classroom setting.

The applicant lacks a clear explanation as to how engaging parents for the paraprofessional training and parent classes will ensure it supports learning in a remote learning environment for the population of students impacted by the COVID-19 crisis. The intent that parents will graduate with the certification is no guarantee for meeting the project objective.

4. No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 17

Selection Criteria - Quality of Management Plan / Adequacy of Resources

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

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

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

Strengths:

1. The applicant defines project activities, timelines, and staff responsibilities in the plan. The staff, which includes a distant learning specialist to provide coaching and modeling for teachers, appear to be sufficient, with relevant experiences and qualifications for accomplishing projected tasks and anticipated outcomes on time and within budget. (pgs. 23-25) 3 pts.

2. The applicant presents costs that seem reasonable relative to teacher performance- based assessment training, establishing personalized and competency-based education materials, guidance, and social emotional support for students, in addition to increasing the teacher workforce. These elements are intended to support the proposed project objectives and benefit the targeted population of students. (pg. 25) 2 pts.

3. The applicant requested funds to support the program objectives and design seem reasonable relative to supporting performance based assessment training, the additional academic and emotional support for every student in the state, and to increase the teacher workforce. These costs will further provide expanded communication channels to assist parents in their decision to have their children participate in face-to-face or remote instruction. (pg. 26) 5 pts.

4. The requested cost to support the project is reasonable for the 30 public schools supported, 2,400+ teachers that are provided online training, and the more than 32,000 students who will receive the benefits of the project. The student applications, continued updates of subject content, and expanded professional development, will be sustainable beyond the grant period. (pg. 26)
6 pts.

Weaknesses:

1. The applicant presents project objectives, however, the management plan with activities, milestones, and persons responsible, is not clearly aligned with the implementation of a remote learning environment program. The plan to increase the teacher force will not occur during the grant period and the paraprofessional teacher program offered to a select group of parents, will not ensure support for engaging students because of the COVID-19 crisis. (pgs. 23-25)

2. The applicant includes one budget line-item stating to contract online for Social Emotional Learning (SEL) activity applications, to help build student resiliency during distance learning and pandemic, which is vaguely discussed in the project narrative. The limited information in the budget narrative relative to the COVID-19 impact makes it difficult to determine if funds can adequately support the proposed project, which is not clearly aligned to implementation of a remote learning environment. (pg. e65)

3. The proposed activities, services, and resource details do not clearly reflect knowledge that aligns with a remote learning environment or to ensure the anticipated project results and outcomes. The applicant presents no specific plan for training parents with the skills needed to work with their children in the remote learning environment. (pgs. 24-26)

4. The proposed project activities, services, and resource details do not clearly correlate with a remote learning environment. They also do not prove reasonable to ensure that the anticipated project results will be met to effectively benefit the number of intended persons to be served. (pg. 26)

Reader's Score: 16

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/22/2020 09:46 AM