

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 04/26/2022 12:35 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Association of Alaska School Boards (S310A220012)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Quality of Project Design	25	25
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	20	19
<b>Quality of Project Personnel</b>		
1. Project Personnel	15	15
<b>Adequacy of Resources</b>		
1. Adequacy of Resources	20	19
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>78</b>
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
1. CPP2	3	3
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 3</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 3</b>		
1. CPP3	3	3
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 4</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 4</b>		
1. CPP4	3	3
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>87</b>

# Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - SFEC Tier 1 Panel - 1: 84.310A

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

Applicant: Association of Alaska School Boards (S310A220012)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

#### 1. A. Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 points).

The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors--

- (1) The extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework.
- (2) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project reflect up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice.
- (3) The extent to which the proposed project is designed to build capacity and yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance.

#### Strengths:

Criterion A1: The conceptual framework's three stated goals of improved infrastructure of family engagement, increased capacity of agencies and staff, and increased capacity of family members within strategic partnerships are clearly articulated and further developed into three objectives within each goal (e29). The milestones information presented by the applicant additionally includes standards and benchmarks for attainment of objectives in figure 2 and again on e161.

Criterion A2: In figure 4 (e35-36), the applicant provides a summary of evidence and research that the Education Northwest materials are based on, and the applicant further notes the rationale for the need to rely on the resources of Education Northwest. The research and evidence are explicitly explained and cited in relation to each of the services and programs proposed in the application. The summarized studies and research are cited comprehensively on e178-182. Additionally, on e36-37, the applicant explains how the AASB staff maintain their engagement and awareness of current research through local, national, and global channels.

Criterion A3: The applicant provides a strong design for increased capacity and post-grant extended returns and results by training families as engaged leaders at the local level, focusing on policy documents at the board level, and creating a 'Train the Trainers' pipeline of effective staff leaders who will use the techniques and framework into the future at the site level (e38).

#### Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were found.

Reader's Score: 25

### Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

**1. B. Quality of the Management Plan (up to 20 points).**

**The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

- (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.**
- (2) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.**
- (3) The adequacy of mechanisms for ensuring high-quality products and services from the proposed project.**
- (4) The extent to which the time commitments of the project director and principal investigator and other key project personnel are appropriate and adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project.**
- (5) How the applicant will ensure that a diversity of perspectives are brought to bear in the operation of the proposed project, including those of parents, teachers, the business community, a variety of disciplinary and professional fields, recipients or beneficiaries of services, or others, as appropriate.**

**Strengths:**

Criterion B1: The applicant has extensively defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones (e162-164), with a schedule of events and meetings (e164), with comprehensive responsibility charts of the AASB (e171) and partners (e176). The management plan provides assurance that objectives will be achieved on time and within budget.

Criterion B2: The applicant provides an extensive list of real-time formative and annual feedback procedures, with regularly scheduled data review sessions. These methods include polling software, participant interviews, learning community/ family conversations, and coaching sessions. Families and staff will be asked to respond to questions on an annual survey. The evaluation team will schedule data review (as the data is available), advisory group feedback (quarterly), updates for the AK FAM coalition (quarterly), workgroup updates (monthly), and implementation team updates (monthly). Additionally, each component has an evaluation tool as well as an intake and exit survey (e42).

Criterion B3: The applicant has provided concrete high-quality examples of the materials to be expected from AASB's in-house creation and design process (e306-334, Appendix I), has listed the software that AASB uses for content creation, explains how co-creation with local agencies and families is undertaken and documented, and explains how continuous feedback will improve created materials from year to year (e44).

Criterion B4: Thorough organization charts of AASB and partner organizations (e171-e176) explain the time commitments and responsibilities of the applicant organization's personnel, in addition to all the partner organizations. The time commitments are explicit and appropriate.

Criterion B5: The applicant has ensured and specifies how the staff (at state, local, and partner levels) represents the families to be served and has detailed a plan for BIPOC family and agency representation at sites. Key project personnel and their tribal affiliations are discussed (e45).

**Weaknesses:**

Criterion B3: There is no rationale for or preamble to the chosen excerpts from the workbook (e306-334) to explain why the chosen sections best exemplify the proposed project.

**Reader's Score:** 19

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel**

**1. C. Project Personnel (up to 15 points).**

The Secretary considers the quality of the personnel who will carry out the proposed project. In determining the quality of project personnel, the Secretary considers the extent to which the applicant encourages applications for employment from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability. In addition, in determining the quality of the management plan and project personnel, the Secretary considers the following factors--

- (1) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director or principal investigator.
- (2) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel.
- (3) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of project consultants or subcontractors.

**Strengths:**

Criterion C1: The project director and staff resumes are listed. The experience of the project director and the director's experience with federal grants is documented and convincing (e47, e65).

Criterion C2: The qualifications and responsibilities of fourteen key project personnel are provided in the attached resumes (e65-124) and in the project narrative on e48, the applicant provides evidence that the personnel have lived experience within the communities to be served. Additionally, the applicant states that preference will be given for BIPOC applicants who are members of the Alaskan indigenous community for the open, transparent, and available job positions (e125-130).

Criterion C3: The applicant has included the resumes for six people in supervisory or key project roles with contractor partners (e112-124), with documented and appropriate qualifications. The contractors have extensive experience with Alaskan agencies and communities.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses in criterion C were found.

**Reader's Score:** 15

**Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources**

**1. D. Adequacy of Resources (up to 20 points).**

The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources for the proposed project. In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors--

- (1) The relevance and demonstrated commitment of each partner in the proposed project to the implementation and success of the project.**
- (2) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project.**
- (3) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the number of persons to be served and the anticipated results and benefits.**

**Strengths:**

Criterion D1: Memoranda of Agreement (MOAs) from all lead partners are included and specific- for example, Stone School Group, Tribal Healthcare, and the Alaska After School Network (e156-158). Partner organizations are detailed (e140), and the goals of AASB and the partner organizations are explained and in alignment (e51).

Criterion D2: The line-item budget for all five years includes meticulous accounting of responsibilities and compensation, paired with a comprehensive budget narrative for each item. Cost accounting and expectations are feasible and aligned with the potential of the project (e336).

Criterion D3: The applicant effectively demonstrates that the project will serve 75% of Alaska's school districts, 59,000 total students and 2000 families (e165-166). The costs are reasonable to the number of persons to be served, and the highly organized accounting of personnel time and resources available provides evidence that the anticipated \$80 per impacted student is sound.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant gives different numbers of families to be served on e53 than e166. It is unclear if 10,000 or 2000 families will be served.

**Reader's Score: 19**

**Priority Questions**

**Competitive Preference Priority 2 - Competitive Preference Priority 2**

- 1. Competitive Preference Priority 2-- Addressing the Impact of COVID-19 on Students, Educators, and Faculty (up to 3 points).**

**Projects that are designed to address the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic, including impacts that extend beyond the duration of the pandemic itself, on the students most impacted by the pandemic, with a focus on underserved students (as defined in the notice inviting applications, NIA) and the educators who serve them, through one or more of the following priority areas:**

- (a) Conducting community asset-mapping and needs assessments that may include an assessment of the extent to which students, including subgroups of students, have become disengaged from learning, including students not participating in in-person or remote instruction, and specific strategies for reengaging and supporting students and their families.**
- (b) Providing resources and supports to meet the basic, fundamental, health and safety needs of students and educators.**
- (c) Addressing students' social, emotional, mental health, and academic need through approaches that are inclusive with regard to race, ethnicity, culture, language, and disability status.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant presents strong evidence that CPP2 is fully addressed through one or more of the listed priority areas.

For criterion CPP2a, the applicant has referenced a contracted asset map of mental health programs and needs within Alaska schools as a result of Covid-19 (Stellar, 2021) as a foundation for proposed services (e23).

For criterion CPP2b, the Alaska Statewide Family Engagement Center (ASFEC) trainings for educators and families focus on social emotional learning and selfcare in response to the COVID-19 pandemic (e24), based on cited educator surveys (SCCS, 2021- e178).

For criterion CPP2c, the ASFEC Alaska Families coalition (AKFAM) which meets quarterly (e6) will inform responsiveness to cultural accessibility and inclusion in mental health supports (e25).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses found.

**Reader's Score:** 3

**Competitive Preference Priority 3 - Competitive Preference Priority 3**

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 3--Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources, and Opportunities (up to 3 points).**

**Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate that it proposes a project designed to promote educational equity and adequacy in resources and opportunity for underserved students--**

**(a) In one or more of the following educational settings:**

- (1) Early learning programs.**
- (2) Elementary school.**
- (3) Middle school.**
- (4) High school.**
- (5) Career and technical education programs.**
- (6) Out-of-school-time settings.**
- (7) Alternative schools and programs.**
- (8) Juvenile justice system or correctional facilities; and**
- (9) Adult learning.**

**(b) That is designed to examine the sources of inequities related to, and implement responses through, one or more of the following:**

**(1) Establishing, expanding, or improving the engagement of underserved community members (including underserved students and families) in informing and making decisions that influence policy and practice at the school, district, or State level by elevating their voices and their perspectives and providing them with access to opportunities for leadership (e.g., establishing student government programs and parent and caregiver leadership initiatives)).**

**(2) Increasing student racial or socioeconomic diversity, through developing or implementing evidence-based policies or strategies that include one or more of the following:**

**(i) Ongoing, robust family and community involvement.**

**(ii) Intra- or inter-district or regional coordination.**

**(iii) Cross-agency collaboration, such as with housing or transportation authorities.**

**(iv) Alignment with an existing public diversity plan or diversity needs assessment.**

**Strengths:**

Criterion CPP3a: The ASFEC program and Stronger Together Transforming Schools (STTS) training is projected to reach 203 schools of students, families, and educators K-12, plus adult learning in the form of citizenship training (e25).

Criterion CPP3b1: Partner districts that use the ASFEC model will implement district strategic plan development, policy development, advisory groups, a statewide coalition, and co-creation of resources for underserved community members to make their voices heard in multiple ways many times over the five years of the grant (e26).

Criterion CPP3b2: Regular meetings of family circles will provide robust family and community involvement, and the Association of Alaska School Boards (AASB) will partner with Regional Education Area Authority (REAA) groups to further engage families through inter-district and agency collaboration (e26).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses found

**Reader's Score: 3**

**Competitive Preference Priority 4 - Competitive Preference Priority 4**

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 4--Strengthening Cross-Agency Coordination and Community Engagement to Advance Systemic Change (up to 3 points).**

**Projects that are designed to take a systemic approach to improving outcomes for underserved students in the following priority area:**

**(a) Establishing cross-agency partnerships, or community-based partnerships with local nonprofit organizations, businesses, philanthropic organizations, or others, to meet family well-being needs.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant provides strong evidence in appendices C and D that there is an existing statewide partnership with regional non-profits and third parties. The applicant further provides a thorough itemization of the partners' organization charts of responsible parties (e176). This project is designed for a systemic approach that creates capacity by strengthening partnerships specifically to meet the mental and well-being needs of families.



**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses found.

**Reader's Score:** 3

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 04/26/2022 12:35 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 04/26/2022 11:11 AM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Association of Alaska School Boards (S310A220012)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Quality of Project Design	25	25
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	20	18
<b>Quality of Project Personnel</b>		
1. Project Personnel	15	15
<b>Adequacy of Resources</b>		
1. Adequacy of Resources	20	20
<b>Sub Total</b>	80	78
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
1. CPP2	3	3
<b>Sub Total</b>	3	3
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 3</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 3</b>		
1. CPP3	3	3
<b>Sub Total</b>	3	3
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 4</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 4</b>		
1. CPP4	3	3
<b>Sub Total</b>	3	3
<b>Total</b>	89	87

# Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - SFEC Tier 1 Panel - 1: 84.310A

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

Applicant: Association of Alaska School Boards (S310A220012)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

#### 1. A. Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 points).

The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors--

- (1) The extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework.
- (2) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project reflect up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice.
- (3) The extent to which the proposed project is designed to build capacity and yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance.

#### Strengths:

Sub-criterion A(1) is demonstrated by both a conceptual framework and a planned structure for implementation (e30-31).

The conceptual framework reflects current research as well as adaptations for Alaska's educational context (e32). Further research alignment is reflected through a synthesis (e35) demonstrating sub-criterion A(2).

Sub-criterion A(3) is addressed by the applicant by proposing a sustainable statewide infrastructure (e28) that includes mindset shift and process conditions for changed practice in districts (e37). Additionally, the planned evaluation will contribute to the knowledge base in the state.

#### Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 25

### Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

#### 1. B. Quality of the Management Plan (up to 20 points).

The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (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.
- (2) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the

operation of the proposed project.

(3) The adequacy of mechanisms for ensuring high-quality products and services from the proposed project.

(4) The extent to which the time commitments of the project director and principal investigator and other key project personnel are appropriate and adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project.

(5) How the applicant will ensure that a diversity of perspectives are brought to bear in the operation of the proposed project, including those of parents, teachers, the business community, a variety of disciplinary and professional fields, recipients or beneficiaries of services, or others, as appropriate.

**Strengths:**

The application addresses sub-criterion B(1) with clearly defined milestones by month for year one, and quarterly in years 2-5 (e39-41).

Sub-criterion B(2) is evident with review planned monthly including multiple methods of gathering feedback (e42).

Sub-criterion B(3) is a strength of the application with planned activities and evidence that families will lead design of materials (e33), stakeholders will review mental health services for cultural responsiveness (e25), and local artists and designers will be engaged to contribute to materials (e42-43).

The application includes many partners (e45) as well as the advisory body to consider multiple perspectives as required by sub-criterion B(5).

**Weaknesses:**

The robust teaming structure described (e44, appendix H) is complex and includes more than 30 partners. It is unclear whether or not one FTE program manager is adequate to oversee such an ambitious structure (e337-344).

**Reader's Score: 18**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel**

**1. C. Project Personnel (up to 15 points).**

The Secretary considers the quality of the personnel who will carry out the proposed project. In determining the quality of project personnel, the Secretary considers the extent to which the applicant encourages applications for employment from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability. In addition, in determining the quality of the management plan and project personnel, the Secretary considers the following factors--

(1) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director or principal investigator.

(2) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel.

(3) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of project consultants or subcontractors.

**Strengths:**

The application demonstrates the experience and qualifications of the project director and key project personnel (e24-25) under sub-criterion C(1) and C(2). It also includes discussion of hiring priorities for staff to be hired (e125-130) if the project is funded. Additional project consultants and subcontractors under sub-criterion C(3) are well explained (appendix B, e47-49).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses found.

**Reader's Score: 15**

**Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources****1. D. Adequacy of Resources (up to 20 points).**

**The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources for the proposed project. In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors--**

- (1) The relevance and demonstrated commitment of each partner in the proposed project to the implementation and success of the project.**
- (2) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project.**
- (3) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the number of persons to be served and the anticipated results and benefits.**

**Strengths:**

Robust partnerships (e49) are a strength of this application under sub-criterion D(1), and are demonstrated by letters of support and memorandums of understanding (appendix D and E, e355-360).

Partnerships support a reasonable cost per sub-criterion D(2) for the proposed project through in-kind matches from partners (e50-51, 362-369). The need for in-state travel is clearly demonstrated (e346-352).

The systemic nature of the proposed project maximizes the potential significance to include fourteen districts with 200 schools, serving 59,000 students (e17), or  $\frac{3}{4}$  of the population of the state (e53) for reasonable cost per sub-criterion D(3).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses found

**Reader's Score: 20**

**Priority Questions****Competitive Preference Priority 2 - Competitive Preference Priority 2****1. Competitive Preference Priority 2-- Addressing the Impact of COVID-19 on Students, Educators,**

and Faculty (up to 3 points).

Projects that are designed to address the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic, including impacts that extend beyond the duration of the pandemic itself, on the students most impacted by the pandemic, with a focus on underserved students (as defined in the notice inviting applications, NIA) and the educators who serve them, through one or more of the following priority areas:

- (a) Conducting community asset-mapping and needs assessments that may include an assessment of the extent to which students, including subgroups of students, have become disengaged from learning, including students not participating in in-person or remote instruction, and specific strategies for reengaging and supporting students and their families.
- (b) Providing resources and supports to meet the basic, fundamental, health and safety needs of students and educators.
- (c) Addressing students' social, emotional, mental health, and academic need through approaches that are inclusive with regard to race, ethnicity, culture, language, and disability status.

**Strengths:**

CPP2(a) is addressed through a statewide asset map of mental health services and a needs assessment (e23-24).

Applicant discussed CPP2(c) through the General Education Provisions Act (GEPA) statement on e10, provision of mental health training for families and professionals with embedded self-care activities (e24) and specific resources designed with and for Alaska native individuals (e22).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses found.

**Reader's Score:      3**

**Competitive Preference Priority 3 - Competitive Preference Priority 3**

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 3--Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources, and Opportunities (up to 3 points).**

Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate that it proposes a project designed to promote educational equity and adequacy in resources and opportunity for underserved students--

(a) In one or more of the following educational settings:

- (1) Early learning programs.
- (2) Elementary school.
- (3) Middle school.
- (4) High school.
- (5) Career and technical education programs.
- (6) Out-of-school-time settings.
- (7) Alternative schools and programs.

**(8) Juvenile justice system or correctional facilities; and**

**(9) Adult learning.**

**(b) That is designed to examine the sources of inequities related to, and implement responses through, one or more of the following:**

**(1) Establishing, expanding, or improving the engagement of underserved community members (including underserved students and families) in informing and making decisions that influence policy and practice at the school, district, or State level by elevating their voices and their perspectives and providing them with access to opportunities for leadership (e.g., establishing student government programs and parent and caregiver leadership initiatives)).**

**(2) Increasing student racial or socioeconomic diversity, through developing or implementing evidence-based policies or strategies that include one or more of the following:**

**(i) Ongoing, robust family and community involvement.**

**(ii) Intra- or inter-district or regional coordination.**

**(iii) Cross-agency collaboration, such as with housing or transportation authorities.**

**(iv) Alignment with an existing public diversity plan or diversity needs assessment.**

**Strengths:**

The proposed project plans to serve students across in-school settings and includes adult learning for employment certification and citizenship (e25) as required under CPP3(a).

The applicant discusses multiple ways to improve engagement of families in making decisions under CPPb(1) at school, district, and state level, and includes survey data to inform proposed services (e26).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses found.

**Reader's Score: 3**

**Competitive Preference Priority 4 - Competitive Preference Priority 4**

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 4--Strengthening Cross-Agency Coordination and Community Engagement to Advance Systemic Change (up to 3 points).**

**Projects that are designed to take a systemic approach to improving outcomes for underserved students in the following priority area:**

**(a) Establishing cross-agency partnerships, or community-based partnerships with local nonprofit organizations, businesses, philanthropic organizations, or others, to meet family well-being needs.**

**Strengths:**

The application demonstrates many committed partners to meet CPP4(a) and includes a quarterly coalition structure with monthly monitoring by project leads (e27).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses found.

**Reader's Score:** 3

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 04/26/2022 11:11 AM