

**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: State of Idaho Board of Education (S425B200031)

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	24
Quality of Management Plan / Adequacy of Resources		
1. Management Plan/Resources	25	22
Sub Total	80	61
Total	80	61

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - FY20 REM - 1: 84.425B

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: State of Idaho Board of Education (S425B200031)

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 documents the issues impacting the rural communities, providing data reflecting the impact on specific ethnic/racial populations, focusing specifically on the Latinx population impacted significantly by the virus. The proposal includes detailed information highlighting the electronic device availability and internet access challenges within this target population. (pgs. e22-23)
- The proposal effectively speaks to the effects of the virus on the population of families engaged with the meat-packing industry that were significantly impacted by the virus.

Weaknesses:

- The proposal mentions collaborating with the Native American population as a strategy to recruit and potentially enroll eligible students. However, within the discussion of the burden of the virus, there was no data or information provided addressing the implications of the virus on Native American children and families. (pg. e24)

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:

- B0: The proposal describes the intent to work specifically with the Latinx population and reach out to the Native American community, both of which are substantially impacted by the virus in this state. This approach reflects a focus to ensure both groups have equal access to the project's activities.
- B1 and B2: The applicant proposes to have materials available in multiple languages to address a broader population of potential eligible children and families that would be underrepresented, reflecting an exceptional approach to this priority. Addressing materials in multiple language also reflects a specific strategy to address service and infrastructure gaps. (pg. e10)
- B1: The applicant's proposal to establish a private-public partnership with the Foundation and a non-profit organization demonstrates an exceptional approach to this priority.
- B1: The proposal to make the program continuously available with the idea to have opportunities for access over the summer to address summer retention loss is a unique approach. (pg. e10-11)
- B2, B3: The plan proposes a broad-based approach to community outreach to connect with both public and non-public school students. This is likely to lead to an increase in opportunities for more children and families to access services, thereby addressing gaps in services that may currently exist. This reflects a strategy to expand the project to increase access for remote learning options. (pgs. e25-26)
- B0 and B3: The proposal indicates a specific plan to connect and work with Homeschool Idaho to directly reach out to the homeschool population. This reflects an effort for ensuring equal access and expand the project providing access to remote learning populations. (pg. e29)
- B4: The plan proposes to continue to explore, expand and accept additional academic offerings over the course of the 3-year funding process. This reflects the project's willingness to continue to allow the project to remain up-to-date with current effective practice. (pgs. E38)
- B3: It is encouraging to see the applicant's proposal to link with the "Quality Matters" online program to strengthen practices and reflect attention to effective practice. (pg. e38)
- B0: The project proposes to conduct a statewide public communications and marketing campaign to inform all families of the program, reflecting a strategy to work on equal access. (pg. e26)

Weaknesses:

- B2: The proposal speaks to using Idaho Digital Learning Academy, Boise State University Lee Pesky Learning Center. It is unclear exactly the age range of the overall online coursework availability to ensure it addresses a broad K-12 perspective. This makes it difficult to determine if the proposal is meeting the gaps across grade levels. (pg. e31)
- B0: There was one sentence about making a guide available to families about how to access the online learning

platform. Unfortunately, there was not information provided explaining this guidance and helping to understand how this document was designed to assist families. It is unclear how the project ensures equal access and treatment for all children and families, especially those not familiar with virtual learning experiences without being able to understand how the guide was designed or structured.

- B4: It is not clear from the proposal how the state proposes to evaluate the evidence and research-based foundations of the materials and programs to be made available.
- B3: The proposal does not address the issue of student's internet access for families in their homes or community. This may impact the project's capacity to expand access to remote learning settings.
- B0: There is no discussion about ensuring any of the materials and programs will be accessible, modified or adapted to meet the needs of children with disabilities, thus this proposal may not ensure equal access to all potentially eligible children.
- B1: no weaknesses.

Reader's Score: 24

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:

- C1: The applicant provides an overview of the state and community outreach plan. This plan addresses the awareness of the program to the broader community and includes strategies to engage families across the spectrum of potentially eligible populations. This aspect speaks to the adequacy of the plan to work towards achieving the project's proposed objectives. (e10)
- C1: The plan provides a comprehensive management plan and timeline, reflecting key attention to the tasks that will need to be accomplished and enhancing the accountability aspects of the project. (pg. e28)
- C2: The project proposed to engage a public-private partnership with two organizations to assist with the initiative. This partnership will bring important additional funds to this initiative. This will likely result in additional funds being allocated to the target populations. This will assist with ensuring adequate funds are available to meet the proposed project objectives.
- C3: The applicant indicates the State will charge only its Indirect Cost rate, and not charge the grant for direct administrative costs such as salaries and benefits. The combination of philanthropic support and not charging direct costs to the grant will enable at least 91% of the total grant award to be allocated to eligible Idaho families. This component reflects the projects costs to be calculated to be very reasonable in relation to the objectives and potential significance. (pg. e14)
- C1: The plan proposes to survey families concerning their satisfaction with the project's activities. These types

of evaluative activities have the potential to allow the project to achieve objectives through examining effort and engaging in continuous improvement. (pg. e32)

- C1: The applicant proposes to look at “grant recipients who successfully complete their studies and advance.” This reflects the project’s intention to hold itself accountable leading to a greater likelihood the project will achieve its objectives.
- C4: The proposal to use the foundation and non-profit organizations to support the initiative positively impacts the costs and reflects support in relation to the number of persons anticipated to benefit from the project. (pgs. e32-33)
- C2: The project objectives and activities reflect the proposed use of funds will adequately support the proposed project activities.

Weaknesses:

- C1: There does not appear to be any personnel with a strong background in technology or special education, or staff directly devoted to these issues. There is one individual with some background in these areas however that person is not tasked with these responsibilities in the management section. Subsequently it is unclear that there are sufficient staff with backgrounds and defined responsibilities to ensure all objectives will be achieved.
- C2: no weaknesses:
- C3 and 4: The proposal does not sufficiently detail that the \$1,000 allocation per child is sufficient to allow a family to access an electronic device, hotspot connection, and access to software. This lack of information makes it difficult to firmly determine if: 1) the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives and design, and 2) the funds are reasonable to support all families participating in the project.

Reader's Score: 22

Status: Submitted

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

Status: Submitted

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

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: State of Idaho Board of Education (S425B200031)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Highest Coronavirus Burden		
1. Coronavirus Burden	20	15
Quality of Project Services and Project Plan		
1. Project Services/Plan	35	28
Quality of Management Plan / Adequacy of Resources		
1. Management Plan/Resources	25	20
Sub Total	80	63
Total	80	63

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - FY20 REM - 1: 84.425B

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: State of Idaho Board of Education (S425B200031)

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:

- Pages 20-25 – The application clearly indicates that the coronavirus burden, especially on the Latino population, is high. According to the reports, data shows that Latinx families have less access to computers and internet and received less instruction during the pandemic remote learning period.
- Pages 22 – The application states that coronavirus hit food processing plants and outdoor recreation places which negatively impacted the communities.
- Pages 22 – The application identifies that unemployment rates in April were the highest ever recorded in the state of Idaho.
- Page 24 – The applicant provides information about the negative impact on social emotional status of some of the neediest students by giving examples of students attempting to take their own lives and students who were placed in foster care.

Weaknesses:

- Pages 20-25 – The application provides limited data on the demographics of the state.
- Pages 20-25 – The applicant discusses mostly the Latino population's burden which is only a small portion of the whole population.

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:

- For criterion B0 - The applicant has sufficient plans in which the program will provide equal access to all groups and prioritize the low-income students who live in rural areas.
 - o Page 10 – The applicant discusses limited English proficiency as a barrier and the applicant plans to address the barrier by getting help from different organizations.
 - o Page 26 – The program specifies a plan to reach out to non-public school students via multiple channels which will minimize equal access issues.
 - o Page 26 – The program provides all materials in English and participants’ native language, and accepts applications either online or through paper documents submitted.
- For criterion B1 - The applicant has a unique, innovative, and exceptional approach to address the needs of disadvantaged students by
 - o Page 32 - creating a public-private partnership where two organizations, along with State Board of Education, support the program with no cost to the project.
 - o Page 33 – starting to work on community outreach as early as July to expedite the implementation and be ready for the fall even without knowing if they will receive a grant.
 - o Page 34 - focusing on summer learning loss and planning to provide microgrants to families during the spring of 2021 and 2022.
- For criterion B2 – The applicant has an effective plan which
 - o Page 31- specifies the services that parents will have access to via microgrants, such as getting computer hardware/software, paying for tuition/fees for digital learning academy and dual enrollment, textbook, curriculum or other instructional materials.
 - o Page 31 – indicates that all of the resources that will be provided to parents have been approved by the state. In addition, the program will enable parents to make suggestions for additional services and products, which will be selected according to established criteria.
 - o Page 35 – identifies gaps with digital devices and online resources especially for private, parochial, charter, and homeschool students and plans to close this gap with the help of this program.
- For criterion B3;
 - o Page 35,36 – The program will definitely help to close the digital divide and expand access to online learning options by offering microgrants to 18,000 disadvantaged students.
- For criterion B4;
 - o Page 37-38- The applicant used some references to different research on page 37 and used “Quality Matters” for their best practices on page 38.

Weaknesses:

- For criterion B2;
 - o Page 35- The applicant states the need for broadband access along with digital device. However, the application lacks information on how to respond to these needs.
- For criterion B3;
 - o Page 79 – The application states an additional performance measure as students’ likelihood to stay in school, complete courses of study, and advance to the next level or graduate. However, it lacks academic measures of success such as summative assessment data, standard mastery data, or targeted growth data in their student outcomes.

- For criterion B4;
- o Pages 37-38 - The applicant fails to show that the proposed project meets this criterion as there is an inadequate amount of citations and references to research and effective practices. The applicant cited three sources, including two research studies and one documentation of best practice, but these only appeared in one section of the application; there are not enough citations and references used throughout the application.

Reader's Score: 28

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:

- For criterion C1- The application has a comprehensive plan that
 - o Page 28 – is laid out on the chart on page 28 along with the action items, responsible parties, and the proposed timeline.
 - o Page 38 – has a strong team of qualified individuals and organizations who could achieve the planned tasks on time.
- For criterion C2 - The proposed used of funds will adequately support the project.
 - o Page 41 – The program will use 5% of the funds for management and 91% for microgrants
 - o Page 41 – The program will utilize philanthropic support from J.A. and Kathryn Albertson Family Foundation.
- For criterion C3 - The proposed plan and the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance.
 - o Pages 41,42 – The application targets to provide access to online learning opportunities to especially rural and the neediest students.
 - o Pages 41,42 – The application reserves 91% of the funds for microgrants which will include multiple goods and services from both national and state-based providers that will help close Idaho's digital divide and help meet the needs of the most vulnerable students by providing access to online resources.
 - o Pages 41,42 – The application grants [REDACTED] per student and up to [REDACTED] per family which is reasonable when you consider providing tech devices, broadband access, and access to multiple online resources.
- For criterion C4;
 - o Based on the application and provided plan, 18,000 students will be served which is adequate and reasonable considering the costs.

Weaknesses:

- For criterion C1, no weaknesses.
- For criterion C2 – The applicant provides limited information.
 - o Page 14 – The application states that the program will allocate [REDACTED] for each student for different products and services. Since it lacks the details of these services and their estimated costs, the information is not sufficient to determine whether the funds will be fully adequate.
- For criterion C3 – The application has limited and unclear information on stated budget items below.
 - o Pages 7, 18, 82 – The application states that J.A. and Kathryn Albertson Family Foundation will charge 5%, but the plan does not provide enough information about where the other 4% goes to.
 - o Pages 7 and 82 – The application states that the program will allocate \$1,000 per student and plans on spending [REDACTED] in the first year, [REDACTED] in the second year, and [REDACTED] in the third year, but does not provide an explanation for the different amounts requested each year.
- For criterion C4 – The applicant lists expected results as likelihood to stay in school, completing the course, and promotion or graduation. However, the application did not consider academic growth data as one of the anticipated results (on page 79 and 80) which makes it difficult to determine whether the costs are totally reasonable in relation to the anticipated results.

Reader's Score: 20

Status: Submitted

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

Status: Submitted

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

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: State of Idaho Board of Education (S425B200031)

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	25
Quality of Management Plan / Adequacy of Resources		
1. Management Plan/Resources	25	20
Sub Total	80	57
Total	80	57

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - FY20 REM - 1: 84.425B

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: State of Idaho Board of Education (S425B200031)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Highest Coronavirus Burden

1. A: Highest Coronavirus Burden (up to 20 Points)

(2) The extent to which the applicant has a high coronavirus burden based on indicators and information factors identified by the applicant in response to Application Requirement 3. (up to 20 points)

Strengths:

The application uses information factors such as the percentage increase of daily case counts, the impact of coronavirus on food processing plants and low-wage service sector workers in particular counties in the state, and the unemployment rate to show the increasing coronavirus burden in Idaho. Moreover, based on indicators and information factors (e.g., number of weekly instruction hours, internet access, and gaps in reading and math), the application shows that students from low-income and Latinx families in Idaho have been adversely impacted by the pandemic. These indicators and information factors provide some evidence that certain counties in the state and particular sub-groups in the state have a coronavirus burden(A-2).

Weaknesses:

1. Although the application emphasizes that "while Idaho's population is not large relative to most states, in many ways, its coronavirus challenges are larger" (page 20), it does not provide sufficient evidence (indicators or information factors) to justify why "its coronavirus challenges are larger" than many other states in the nation. The application frequently uses data from a subset of the population (e.g., Latino students and families, and food processing plants in certain counties) to show the coronavirus burden in the state. As a result, the degree of the coronavirus burden to the entire population in Idaho is unclear. (A-2)

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:

1. The application describes three strategies to address equal access and treatment, including using the Idaho System for Education Excellence (ISEE) to identify educationally disadvantaged students, directly contacting each private and parochial school in the state to identify eligible students and families, and conducting a statewide public communications and marketing campaign to inform all families of the program (pages 25-26). These strategies provide strong evidence that the project includes high-quality and sufficient strategies for ensuring equitable access and treatment for eligible students who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability. (B-0)

2. The State Board will partner with a statewide education nonprofit (Bluum) and the J.A. and Kathryn Albertson Family Foundation to implement the project. This not only ensures that 91% of the funds will go directly to families, but also utilizes the expertise and resources from these organizations. Moreover, the project includes a plan to ensure an expedited implementation of the project in 2020 (e.g., collaborate with Bluum in July to identify eligible students, and use existing online courses approved by the state). In addition, in 2021 and 2022, the project plans to award microgrants each spring to give families time to acquire resources for use over the summer to mitigate learning loss and close achievement gaps. These strategies provide evidence that the proposed project is an adequate approach to addressing absolute priority 1. (B-1)

3. The project identifies the gap as a “digital divide” (inequity between students’ access to remote learning across Idaho, page 17). The proposed project includes a plan to identify educationally disadvantaged students through multiple strategies, which is likely to ensure that more educationally disadvantaged students will be able to expand their access to remote learning. As a result, the application provides sufficient evidence that specific gaps in opportunities have been identified and the project has a plan to address the gaps. (B-2)

4. The microgrants through this project allow students to acquire approved educational goods and services through an online marketplace. The project also states that it will grow its online offerings in out years. This provides some evidence that the services to be provided by the proposed project will expand access to remote learning options and lead to improvements in student outcomes. (B-3)

5. The application includes a plan to use knowledge from research and effective practice to expand offerings; create competition on price, innovation, and quality; and to better serve students for whom the traditional system is not working. The application also states that the standards and practices of Quality Matters will be used to assure quality of offerings (page 20). This provides some evidence that the project has a plan to use up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice. (B-4)

Weaknesses:

1. The project plan does not include sufficient detail in many places. For instance, the application does not describe the types of services that will be made available to students through the project in 2021 and 2022. It merely mentions that the project “will establish criteria and processes for adding additional products and services to its offerings” (page 31). Similarly, the application does not describe what exact tools will be provided to help parents choose the most appropriate and effective services for their children, although it mentions that “both the online marketplace site and written documentation will include tools and information to help parents choose the most appropriate and effective services for their children” (page 30). (B-1)

2. Although the application states that “there is a 100% likelihood that Inspire Idaho will expand access to remote learning

opportunities for vulnerable Idaho students”, the application does not describe in what ways the services to be provided by the proposed project have a 100% likelihood to expand access to remote learning options and lead to improvements in student outcomes. (B-3)

3. Except for the two citations on page 37 and the reference to the standards and practices of Quality Matters, the rest of the application does not refer to knowledge/evidence from research and effective practice. Even when referring to research work, the application does not describe the specific knowledge the project will draw on from the research to inform the quality of the services to be provided by the proposed project. This raises the concern of whether the design of the project is well-informed by research and effective practice. (B-4)

Reader's Score: 25

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 project management team consists of personnel from different parties of the public-private partnership (State Board of Education, J.A. and Kathryn Albertson Family Foundation, Bluum, and the State Department of Education). The responsibilities of each person involved in the project are clearly described in the application. The management plan identifies activities and the responsible parties at every stage of the project. The plan to award microgrants each spring in 2021 and 2022 is a plus. As a result, the application demonstrates a strong management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget. (C-1)

2. The project is allocating \$18,348,624 to microgrants (budgeted on line 6). These funds will flow to the providers of the educational goods and services for students. This provides strong evidence that the proposed use of funds will adequately support the proposed project. (C-2)

3. The project asks for [REDACTED] The microgrant funds from this project can be used to acquire approved educational goods and services through an online (or paper) marketplace. The J.A. and Kathryn Albertson Family Foundation has committed operational funding at a rate of 5% of the federal award, up to \$1 million. At least 91% of the funds will directly go to families through microgrants. As a result, the costs seem very reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project. (C-3)

4. The project will award microgrants of \$1,000 to approximately 18,000 students. The costs seem reasonable in relation to the number of persons to be served. (C-4)

Weaknesses:

1. Although the project aims to provide students and families microgrants to acquire approved educational goods and services, it does not sufficiently describe the anticipated results and benefits of this project. As a result, it is unclear whether the costs in relation to the anticipated results and benefits are reasonable. (C-4)

Reader's Score: **20**

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