

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/20/2020 12:56 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Ohio Department of Education (S425B200035)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Highest Coronavirus Burden		
1. Coronavirus Burden	20	20
Quality of Project Services and Project Plan		
1. Project Services/Plan	35	31
Quality of Management Plan / Adequacy of Resources		
1. Management Plan/Resources	25	20
Sub Total	80	71
Total	80	71

Technical Review Form

Panel #7 - FY20 REM - 7: 84.425B

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Ohio Department of Education (S425B200035)

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:

Significant impact on urban areas illustrated by rising unemployment, Covid-19 infection rates disproportionately high in minority groups, limited to no broadband access, and pre-existing chronic health challenges. Show a high-level of need by families and this project is design to provide educational supports. P1-3

Children most at-risk increasing as Medicaid enrollment rises, SNAP & TANF benefits enrollment grows, and broadband access disparities exist illustrating a high impact on families. P3

Education providers struggle to provide special education services remotely, which can accelerate the learning loss by special education students. P4

Coordination of philanthropic, private, and public entities-initiated the programs to provide support to families in need and allow families and students to focus on learning and engage in the programs. P5-6

Weaknesses:

No weakness found.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Services and Project Plan

1. B: Quality of Project Services and Project Plan (up to 35 points)

The Secretary considers the quality of project services and project plan.

In determining the quality of the project services and project plan, the Secretary considers the quality and sufficiency of strategies for ensuring equal access and treatment for eligible project participants who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability. (up to 5 points)

In addition, the Secretary considers--

(1) The extent to which the proposed project is an exceptional approach to absolute priority being addressed and includes a detailed project plan for addressing the absolute priority. (up

to 10 points)

(2) The extent to which specific gaps or weaknesses in services, infrastructure, or opportunities have been identified and will be addressed by the proposed project to respond to the needs of students. (up to 10 points)

(3) The likelihood that the services to be provided by the proposed project will expand access to remote learning options and lead to improvements in student outcomes. (up to 5 points)

(4) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project reflect up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice. (up to 5 points)

Strengths:

The state recognizes differing needs of students according to identified segments (regular education, English-language learners, economically disadvantaged, special education) as well as other groups (e.g., gender, grade levels, and various ethnic and racial groups) and individual differences relevant to individualized classroom instruction, with an understanding of key segments and their unique needs, the state may be able to consistently and systematically meet the expectations of one or more of the student segments. Further, the state can then identify which segments to focus on in the future or how to attract students within those segments. This can increase the state's agility and responsiveness to changing student and community needs of the traditionally underrepresented.

(1)The learning exchange and network platform approach (RemotEDx) for the development of a field-initiated project outlined addresses the priority. By creating opportunities to identify, share, and refine field practices the network and its sub projects increase the school systems' ability to impact teacher excellence and the use of remote learning excellence shared in the RemotEDx exchange. Including a detailed prospective field-initiated learning such as the Ohio Stem Network, StartSOLE, Teaching Institute for Excellence and Bonds of Union. RemotEDX is also designed to use State's assets to respond to potential weaknesses that could affect student outcomes and seeks to distribute the key remote learning capabilities to maintain long-term gains toward achieving its strategic objectives. P6

(1)The applicant describes The five key design components and their responsibilities which provides guidance to ensure implementation is taking place. This is instrumental in the project growing the number of RemotEDx users, increasing the access to remote learning and serving more at-risk students.. P11-17

(1)The use of best practice research for the field-initiated models fosters innovation based on evidence-based learning strategies and is likely to increase the quality, innovation, and adoption of remote learning exemplars. P11

(1)Collaboration with partners to offer state-wide access to the internet and technology ensures at-risk populations have remote educational access to coaching and counseling reducing the chance of at-risk students suffering further learning loss and improving student outcomes P12-13

(1)The further development of the partnership plan with Ohio's existing remote education support partners at a state-wide level supports an ability to increase student access, participation, and improved outcomes and uses the grant funds in a leveraged and possibly more efficient manner. P13

(2)Clearly stated gaps and specific solutions to the gaps demonstrate an understanding of how to respond and address student needs through an integrated approach of new systems aligning with current networks and technology platforms currently in use by the educators in the state. P17-18

(3)Data-driven solutions will be fostered by the established feedback loop process. Student and educator needs will be identified on a state-wide level such as special education services, reliable internet, and profession development on supporting at-risk students. This type of robust remote educational data collection will help meet the goals of expanding remote learning options and engage student in learning to support higher student outcomes.P19-20

(3)Using prior experience with programs like Ohio STEM Network Learning and leveraging prior knowledge can increase the rate of adoption of RemotEDx across the state. P21

(4)Research from multiple sources was used to develop plan integrates research and best practices from current educational and industry professionals as cited in the narrative. P21

Weaknesses:

- (2) Not clearly identifying the specifics for development of feedback loop from all stakeholders, educational professionals, and communities may limit continuous improvement which is a potential gap or weakness not address by the state.
- (2) The state's definition for "at-risk" students is quite broad and without an understanding of key student populations and their unique needs (for example English Language learners, Special education sub categories), the state may not be able to consistently and systematically meet the expectations of one or more of these sub student segments.
- 3) No weaknesses noted.
- (4) Research based evidence was present in the narrative in a limited fashion, greater details on alignment with the overall project could be more effective in demonstrating the services being provided are most effective.

Reader's Score: 31

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 has a detailed description of staffing and estimated time commitments by position and separates the six project tasks out by timelines and expected completion date. Additionally the management plan details how each position is compensated under this project. Salary for each position under this project; Amounts of time, such as hours or percentage of time to be expended by each person under this project. The importance of each position to the success of the project was included and a basis for cost estimates. P22-28
- (2) Cost estimates and budget are in line with scope and scale of the project. The state provides an itemized estimate of materials and supplies by nature of expense or general category, purpose of the supplies and how they relate to project success, and basis for cost estimates or computations are included in detailed chart form with explanations and rationale which support the project. (Budget narrative)
- (3) Costs calculations use a formal and systematic method for calculating the cost of each action plan required by the plans' strategic objectives and built in methods to gather feedback from several resources and partnerships in the educational community allow for design flexibility, and ensure the core deliverable of RemotEDx is reasonably funded relative to the overall project design and fosters a budget that is reasonable considering the large scale of the overall project. P31-33
- (4) The number of persons served by the project are aligned to the estimate impact on creating substantive change in the approach to education as the project has the potential to impact tens of thousands of students in a positive way. P29

Weaknesses:

(1)Timelines for implementation are weighted for completion early in the project, which may cause poor results in adoption.The scale of the project and costs associated require alignment and coordination in the implementation, the emphasis of the earlier weighted timeline may cause the state to not fully vet or adopt a partner that is unable to meet the timeline. Having a timeline that accounts for the possibility of some contraction in service providers for example may benefit the project.

(2)Without formal methods for systematic action planning for all strategic objectives, the project may not achieve some of its objectives in the desired time-frame and will effect using funds will not be able to support the new timelines efficiently or with enough adequacy if cost were to increase.

(3) No weaknesses noted.

(4)While comparative data from within the academic community will be used to improve fiscal solvency and operational efficiency, there is no evidence that comparative data is being used with partners or vendors after the original RFP in the project proposal. Having comparable fiscal numbers for the ongoing cost can support fiscal prudence and ensure cost remain reasonable and are used to support operational and strategic decision-making and innovation.

Reader's Score: 20

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/20/2020 12:56 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/20/2020 12:56 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Ohio Department of Education (S425B200035)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Highest Coronavirus Burden		
1. Coronavirus Burden	20	20
Quality of Project Services and Project Plan		
1. Project Services/Plan	35	30
Quality of Management Plan / Adequacy of Resources		
1. Management Plan/Resources	25	21
Sub Total	80	71
Total	80	71

Technical Review Form

Panel #7 - FY20 REM - 7: 84.425B

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Ohio Department of Education (S425B200035)

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 clearly describes 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. For example, the applicant posits that as of May 20, 2020, Black Ohioans, who comprise 14% of Ohio's overall population, made up 25% of COVID-19 cases. Latinos, who comprise 3.9% of Ohio's population, made up 6% of COVID-19 cases thus demonstrating the percentage of minorities impacted by COVID-19 (e16). The applicant further explains the stressors such as health disparities, economic and educational challenges and that have impacted the state directly related to need analysis of the proposed project (e17- 19). For example, the applicant cites that in the final week of April 2020, nearly a million Ohioans filed unemployment claims; (a 1,500% increase over April 2019 and the 6th worst unemployment rate of any state at 16.8%. Furthermore, the applicant asserts that half of Ohio's school-age children (48.7%) are Medicaid enrolled. Between February 2020 and May 2020, Medicaid enrollment increased by 6%, a rate 20 times greater than the period from December 2019 to February 2020. More than 160,000 Ohioans enrolled in Medicaid in that period, with children ages 5-18 making up one-quarter of new enrollees (e18). Data from the American Community Survey (ACS 2018) indicates that 11.8% of Ohioans are without broadband access; however, district specific estimates reveal wide disparities in access. The applicant overwhelmingly demonstrates the need for broadband access to educate the target population citing that 18.8% of children in high-poverty districts and 19.5% of children in Ohio's rural districts have no broadband access.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Services and Project Plan

1. B: Quality of Project Services and Project Plan (up to 35 points)

The Secretary considers the quality of project services and project plan.

In determining the quality of the project services and project plan, the Secretary considers the quality and sufficiency of strategies for ensuring equal access and treatment for eligible project participants who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability. (up to 5 points)

In addition, the Secretary considers--

(1) The extent to which the proposed project is an exceptional approach to absolute priority

being addressed and includes a detailed project plan for addressing the absolute priority. (up to 10 points)

(2) The extent to which specific gaps or weaknesses in services, infrastructure, or opportunities have been identified and will be addressed by the proposed project to respond to the needs of students. (up to 10 points)

(3) The likelihood that the services to be provided by the proposed project will expand access to remote learning options and lead to improvements in student outcomes. (up to 5 points)

(4) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project reflect up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice. (up to 5 points)

Strengths:

The applicant proposes to leverage existing programs and services, create new opportunities and offerings and scale those opportunities statewide with a focus on equal opportunity for all students which will be a key component of the statewide strategic plan for education (attachment).

SUB 1: The applicant proposes to address Absolute Priority 3. The applicant describes an exceptional approach to absolute priority 3 citing they will coordinate, integrate, replicate and scale Ohio's innovative field-initiated student learning and remote education exemplars to significantly increase student access to transformative remote caring, teaching and learning opportunities as well as improve student outcomes and close the State's equity gap by incorporating a five point plan (e13). The proposed five point plan will include, but is not limited to launch RemotEDx, which connects educators and schools to innovative field initiated student learning and remote education exemplars to exchange ideas, integrate concepts and transform remote education offerings (e26-28). The plan will also establish a companion RemotEDx Network and Coordinating Council to inform policies and practices and enhance partnerships as a means of establishing formal feedback loops to foster educational improvement and access across Ohio's education community (e26-28). The applicant also provides a list of partnering organizations that will facilitate the applicant in these improvement and access efforts. Partners include INFOhio, Educational Service Centers, Information Technology Centers, Ohio Distance Learning Association, Ohio STEM Learning Network, Ohio PTA Teaching Institute for Excellence in STEM and Ohio's internet-based schools. Additionally, the applicant provides a logic model (e25) illustrating proposed short and long term outcomes for Rethinking K-12 Education. Specifically, the applicant proposes to increase remote access to more at-risk students (short-term) and engage more students while concurrently decreasing the equity gaps to improve student success (long-term).

SUB 2: The applicant also identifies gaps and weaknesses in services that will be addressed within the scope of the project. Specifically, the applicant asserts the primary gaps in services and infrastructure include, but are not limited to: student access to the internet (69%); student access to hardware (laptop, tablet, etc.) (54%); identifying appropriate learning options for special student populations (51%); staff capacity to implement remote learning (26%); assessing student access to remote learning (22%); understanding frequency of teacher connection/interaction with students (20%); and knowledge of effective remote learning strategies (18%). (e34). Moreover, the applicant notes that educators struggled to provide Ohio's students with disabilities (16% of students) services close to the manner prescribed in their individualized education programs. Additionally, the applicant cited concerns about staying in contact with students who are homeless or reside in foster care (e19). The applicant notes that RemotEDx has been designed to respond to leverage the State's assets to respond to weaknesses—especially regarding infrastructure and service. Specifically, each school and district, and in some cases, regional groups of districts, have identified, developed and deployed remote learning capabilities that suit their particular needs (e33).

SUB 3: The applicant proposes to expand services citing that the Ohio Department of Education issued a Remote Learning Resource Guide with information on remote education efforts and instructional supports to aid these efforts. As equally important, the applicant notes that Ohio issued guidance for educators and volunteers to assist in identifying potential instances of child abuse and neglect that may adversely impact the remote learning environment.

SUB 4: The applicant further asserts that design theory behind the evidence-based RemotEDx model is that greater coordination, integration and expansion planning among Ohio's remote education, professional learning, special education, information technology and innovative thought partners and providers will increase access to remote education and improve student outcomes statewide.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not clearly specify how they will address underrepresented groups based on race, color, national origin, gender, and age. Specifically, the applicant does not specify how they will identify the target population for at risk children.

SUB 4: The applicant does not address the components of the Ohio Stem Learning or the components that are parallel with the proposed project. The applicant did not cite any research regarding the efficacy of RemoteEdEx.

Reader's Score: 30

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 1: The applicant clearly describes the adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget. For example, key project staff includes the executive leadership, project lead, RemotEDx manager, subject matter experts, and project support staff. The applicant notes the work will begin within 90 days of grant award and will involve the Coordinating Council first developing the criteria for high quality remote education models (e41 – 42). The applicant identifies task, responsible, party and the duration of the task. For example, the applicant asserts the Project Lead will also convene the RemotEDx Coordinating Council to begin Council activities relative to input on the plan and oversight of the project. This task will begin at the time of grant award with drafting of the plan and initiation of the hiring process. The Comprehensive Plan development process begins with a meeting of the Steering Committee and will be completed upon approval by the Coordinating Council. It is expected this will take 90 days. The plan will be updated on an annual basis, or more frequently if necessary, as a result of monitoring and feedback.

SUB 2: The applicant asserts that cost estimates for staffing are based on comparable positions employed by the Department. Additionally, contracted expenses are based on comparable activity and functionality procured by the Department that adequately supports the proposed project (e44-45). Moreover, costs are reasonable because the project

is designed to achieve a rapid escalation of high-quality remote education opportunities for students.

SUB 3: The applicant describes performance measure in relation to number of persons to be served denoting that each performance measure will be reported annually and monitored by the Coordinating Council and Steering Committee. Performance measures will include, but are not limited to: the number of students served by the project; percentage of parents who reported satisfaction with the remote education options available via a parent survey; the number and different types, as defined by the grantee, of new remote education options provided via tracking new models; and the number of students who reported satisfaction with the remote education option they used via a student survey (e46-48). Cost are reasonable in relation to objectives, design, and significance.

SUB 4: The cost estimates are aligned to to produce a positive impact on tens of thousands of students who are directly impacted by the proposed project (e46).

Weaknesses:

SUB 4: The applicant does not clearly describe the metrics for the proposed partnerships, thus it is unclear if the costs are reasonable in relation to the number of persons to be served and to the anticipated results and benefits. (e46-48).

Reader's Score: 21

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/20/2020 12:56 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/20/2020 12:56 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Ohio Department of Education (S425B200035)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Highest Coronavirus Burden		
1. Coronavirus Burden	20	20
Quality of Project Services and Project Plan		
1. Project Services/Plan	35	30
Quality of Management Plan / Adequacy of Resources		
1. Management Plan/Resources	25	21
Sub Total	80	71
Total	80	71

Technical Review Form

Panel #7 - FY20 REM - 7: 84.425B

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Ohio Department of Education (S425B200035)

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 provides clear, measurable data on indicators that demonstrate how coronavirus is affecting the state. The applicant concedes that the U.S. Department of Education's coronavirus burden measure indicates that affects are relatively low; however, additional indicators present an alternative (e16-e19).

The applicant provides data on indicators that are both directly tied to K-12 education and indirectly tied to K-12 education.

Examples of direct indicators include the following:

- (1) The applicant surveyed educators and reports that they struggled to implement services in the Individualized Education Plan (IEP) for students with disabilities (which comprises 16% of the public school enrollment; e19).
- (2) The applicant provides data to support that among school-aged children, the state has the 8th highest rate of Black children living in poverty (39.1%; e18). Minority students of low socioeconomic status are already at-risk of falling behind, and coronavirus may increase the risk of falling further behind.

Examples of indirect indicators include the following:

- (1) health factors (opioid crisis, infant mortality, mental health);
- (2) unemployment (the increase of claims range from 400% to 1200% over those of 2009);
- (3) natural disaster (flooding); and
- (4) poverty.

(e18-e19)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 20

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: The applicant provides exceptional detail regarding how the state will ensure equal access and treatment of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age or disability. Approximately 77% of the state's students are considered "at-risk", including students with disabilities, minority students, and students from low socioeconomic backgrounds. As such, the state has incorporated how to address the whole child in its delivery of its RemotEDx Platform. For example, the platform promotes the idea of care and safety for all students, including behavioral, mental, and physical supports and career counseling. (e21-e23). The logic model also highlights the focus on at-risk students (e25). With this evidence taken as a whole, the state ensures that students groups that have been traditionally underrepresented will have increased access to virtual learning and other behavioral supports.

(1) The applicant presents a plausible logic model that clearly takes into consideration students who are at-risk (e25). It also describes strategies that will improve remote education opportunities for the state's most at-risk students (the Exchange, Network and Learning Academy, Connectivity Crusaders, Support Squad, Coordinating Council, and Feedback Loops) (e26-e28). These strategies comprise an exceptional approach to transforming K-12 education in the state by providing high-quality remote leadership opportunities. The applicant also describes more than adequate remote education support partners (e29-e33).

(2) The state has identified gaps in services in the logic model and narrative (e25; e32-e35). Some of the needs identified by the applicant include (1) consistent access to transformative remote education (caring, teaching, and learning); (2) networking; (3) reliable internet; and (4) remote professional development. The applicant addresses how the project will meet the needs by employing a series of project strategies. For example, the applicant proposes to launch RemotEDx where schools and educators can connect with remote education exemplars and providers. In addition, the RemotEDx network and learning academy will promote best practices with the goal of integrating remote education models, replicating them, and scaling them up for statewide impact. The "connectivity crusaders" will remove barriers to internet connectivity (e25-27). All of these strategies taken together have the potential to transform remote learning in the state.

(3) The RemoteEDx platform has the potential to improve student outcomes. Based on a case study of a school called Metro, a similar platform increased learning outcomes such that Metro was, "the highest performing school in the State when factoring in the percentage of economically disadvantaged students." (e36).

(4) The applicant's proposed project aligns with several frameworks for remote learning (e36). The frameworks are published in peer-reviewed journals and represent a solid theoretical basis for the RemotEDx concept.

Weaknesses:

Equal Access: With 77% of the school population considered “at-risk,” it is difficult to tell how the RemotEDx platform would serve specific populations that are very at risk. With a high number of students considered “at-risk,” the intervention may not target the students with the most need.

(1) No weaknesses noted.

(2) No weaknesses noted.

(3) The applicant does not discuss the components of Ohio STEM Network Learning and how similar these components are to the RemotEDx platform. As such, it is difficult to understand whether there is evidence that suggests that RemotEDx would have similar outcomes, especially for economically disadvantaged students.

(4) The applicant does not cite research relating to the efficacy or effectiveness of the components of RemoteEDx. Although it is understandable that a new platform like RemotEDx does not have efficacy data to cite, it would be reasonable for the applicant to find efficacy studies of the components of RemotEDx. The applicant states that the component parts of RemotEDx are the strategies contained in the logic model (e24-e25). Efficacy of component parts could include research on public-private exchanges, feedback loops in a school setting, continuous improvement practices, etc.

Reader's Score: 30

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 outlines appropriate responsibilities, timelines and milestones for accomplishing project tasks on time and within budget (e38-e44). The applicant outlines the role of leadership, project management, subject matter experts, support personnel, and advisory committees. The management plan provides timelines and milestones for project tasks. The project describes a clear plan to make improvement on five performance measures. The applicant provides baseline data and performance target data for each measure (e46-e47).

(2) The applicant's proposed use of funds seem adequate to support the proposed project. The anticipated personnel costs are conservative and aligned with contract rates in similar positions (e44-e45).

(3) The costs seem reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and significance of the proposed project. As

mentioned in (1) above, the applicant described a clear plan to make improvements on five performance measures (e46-47). The targets were achievable and ambitious.

(4) The costs seem reasonable in relation to number of students who will be affected by the project activities. The applicant states that tens of thousands of students may be positively affected in a meaningful way (e46). Furthermore, if the applicant is dedicated to serving groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age or disability (as stated in Selection Criteria B), the project has the potential to make an even greater impact on these specific students.

Weaknesses:

(1) The timelines for completion of the six project tasks seem very front-loaded during the grant period. For example, all six project tasks will be completed within 210 days of the grant award (i.e., less than a year) (e41-e44). In the course of the three-year grant, it is unclear what will happen during the remaining two years.

(2) No weaknesses noted.

(3) No weaknesses noted.

(4) It is difficult to determine whether the costs are reasonable with respect to the number of students being served. Since the applicant does not propose to monitor external partners with any described performance measures, it is hard to determine how well the schools, students, and parents will be served.

Reader's Score: 21

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/20/2020 12:56 PM