

**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: University of Hawaii (S310A220029)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Quality of Project Design	25	24
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	18
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Project Personnel	15	15
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Adequacy of Resources	20	20
Sub Total	80	77
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
1. CPP2	3	3
Sub Total	3	3
Competitive Preference Priority 3		
Competitive Preference Priority 3		
1. CPP3	3	3
Sub Total	3	3
Competitive Preference Priority 4		
Competitive Preference Priority 4		
1. CPP4	3	3
Sub Total	3	3
Total	89	86

Technical Review Form

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

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: University of Hawaii (S310A220029)

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 proposed Dual Capacity Building Framework (e19) has been funded by the DOE with research conducted at Harvard. The conceptual framework is detailed, with reasonable activities and products, leading to clearly articulated short- and long-term outcomes in the logic model (e58-63).

Criterion A2: The applicant references the research of Weiss (e21) regarding the waking hours of students to inform the rationale for services. On e23, the applicant references University of Chicago research into Family and Community Engagement practices that are reflected in this project design, and further research into the importance of building bridges and mutually agreed-upon outcomes (e24).

Criterion A3: On e25, tri-level capacity building is articulated. At the local level, materials will be available for continuation of literacy events. On e26, e140, and e148, course descriptions and syllabi are included for local education agencies to offer three continuing education credits onsite in a Train the Trainers model for salary advancement. On e27, the applicant demonstrates that the training materials are to be integrated into pre-service training requirements at the University of Hawaii. The WestEd modules described on e28 and e171 will be made available for further Train the Trainers sessions. Additionally, the applicant stresses the perceived necessity by multiple agencies in Hawaii to educate teachers on the history of the Compacts of Free Association (COFA) treaties, the impacts of US nuclear testing in the Pacific Islands, and the ramifications for Micronesian migrants in Hawaii (e29).

Weaknesses:

Criterion A3: It is unclear that the funded activities and partnerships that are designed to build capacity (e25) will be funded and supported locally without grant resources into the future past the 5-year grant cycle.

Reader's Score: 24

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 provides clear objectives, responsibilities, timelines, and milestones in the table on e35. On e39, detail of the abbreviations in the table is helpfully provided. The management plan of Hawaii Family Engagement Centers, Phase Two (HFEC II, a continuation of currently funded HFEC I) is adequate to achieve the outcomes on time and within budget.

Criterion B2: The applicant describes how Likert scale surveys of open-ended items will be regularly administered for feedback, and continuous improvement is built into the analysis of items with low ratings so that they may be prioritized for corrective action (e40).

Criterion B4: The applicant provides time commitments and compensation for project personnel in the budget on e167, and both are adequate and appropriate.

Criterion B5: The applicant effectively describes how a diversity of perspectives will be incorporated through advisory councils and focus groups of parents, educators, and administrators, and participant feedback (e40-41).

Weaknesses:

Criterion B3: On e35, the applicant does not clearly articulate that information collection will be ensured at all anticipated gathering and disseminating points. In the table on e36, information about deliverables and the expected process ("develop and improve training", "expand website") is missing. It is difficult to determine the adequacy of mechanisms to ensure high-quality services.

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:

Criterion C1: The qualifications of the Principal Investigator are clearly articulated on the CV provided on e89, including the information that this PI has been in place at the University of Hawaii since 2018 on the first phase of this initiative. Traditionally underrepresented groups are represented.

Criterion C2: On e89-133, the applicant includes detailed CVs of all project personnel that are in place. It is reasonable to anticipate that the applicant will fill the project coordinator position in a timely fashion. Traditionally underrepresented groups are represented.

Criterion C3: The applicant includes a summary of the qualifications of all principal project consultants and sub-contractors on e43-45, with ample evidence of adequacy. Additionally, traditionally underrepresented groups are represented in the biographies and information on the consultants.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses 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: The applicant provides letters of cooperation and demonstrated commitment from the Hawaii Department of Education (e64), letters from superintendents of schools on Kauai 'I, Oahu, and other islands (e73), in addition to multiple letters from the University and community partners (e80-89). Additionally, this project proposal is a continuation of the previously-funded 5-year Hawaii Family Engagement Center grant, so partnerships at all levels are already in place (e17). The applicant takes care to explicitly detail the commitments in the narrative (e45-50).

Criterion D2: The applicant provides a detailed budget of reasonable costs (e167) and additionally explains that staff time will be contributed by the Hawaii Department of Education, and the existing coordination of cross-agency partnerships will maximize the use of existing resources (e50).

Criterion D3: The applicant effectively demonstrates that the project is supported at the state level and will use Hawaii Department of Education resources to implement the training for existing and future pre-service teachers. Syllabi are provided for the K-3 (e140-147) and MS/HS (e148-156) courses at the university level, which constitutes future capacity for future teachers being trained and credentialed in Hawaii.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were 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:

CPP2a: The project includes a comprehensive needs assessment (e25) with specialized personnel such as: English Language coordinators, specialized resource teachers, academic officers, bilingual/bicultural school home assistants (BSHA), homeless concerns liaisons, literacy coaches, and Title I linkers.

CPP2b: Staff training in the form of two 3-credit, 15-week professional development programs are designed to meet social and emotional learning needs in family partnerships (e13).

CPP2c: The project is designed to address and prioritize underserved communities with culturally responsive and equitable access in all activities (e35).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were 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:

CPP3a: The professional development will occur in four school cohorts, with each cohort being a mix of six elementary, middle, and high schools (e27).

CPP3b2: The applicant proposes a project that will increase the diversity of families that are actively engaged through training to educators for activities designed to target Micronesian and other cultural and linguistic groups in Hawaii, where 28% of residents speak 130 languages at home. This will occur with the ongoing collaboration of the Hawaii Department of Education (e17), which has been a partner for the 2017-2021 cycle of funding (Hawaii Family Engagement Center I) and intends to continue in 2022-2027 in this cycle, if funded (Hawaii Family Engagement Center II).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were 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:

CPP4: In addition to the partnership with the Hawaii Department of Education (HIDOE) (e17), the applicant details a plan (e30) to collaborate with the juvenile justice system and with several faith-based organizations that are central to Micronesian life. In addition, on e22, the applicant lists the partnership with Ohana Support Network (OSN). OSN consists of Hawaii State Departments of Human Services, Health, and Education.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were 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: University of Hawaii (S310A220029)

Reader #2: *****

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

Technical Review Form

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

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: University of Hawaii (S310A220029)

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:

The underlying conceptual framework is well demonstrated in a theory of action (e20-21) and logic model summary (e58) as required by sub-criterion A(1).

Under sub-criterion A(2), the proposed project reflects up-to-date research and practice as described in the research summary (e22-23) and exemplified by the design of the school-based cohorts (e28).

The application includes a detailed sustainability plan (e33) under sub-criterion A(3) and includes several activities designed to improve educator practice over the long term such as pre-service educator preparation (e26-27) and Academic Parent Teacher Teams (APTT) (e28).

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:

Under sub-criterion B(1), the applicant describes a strong management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project. The plan includes a cadence of meetings (e35) and detailed project timeline (e36-40) with milestones and defined responsibilities.

The application adequately defines a continuous improvement process, including quarterly progress reports and corrective actions (e35, e40) under sub-criterion B(2).

In order to ensure family-friendly and understandable resources for multilingual families, the project design includes consultation with program participants in revision of materials (e40), and budget for translation and interpretation under sub-criterion B(3).

Time commitments are appropriate and adequate to meet the objectives proposed (e167-169) as required by sub-criterion B(4).

Per sub-criterion B(5), the advisory council includes diverse perspectives and meets quarterly (e36) which mirrors the progress reporting timelines. The applicant will also conduct surveys and focus groups to inform the programs (e40).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 20

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 director staff in the proposed project are well-qualified (e41-42) under sub-criterion C(1).

Key project personnel are well qualified, including qualifications for a vacancy (e42-43), and detailed GEPA statements on multilingual staff and hiring practices (e7) under sub-criterion C(2).

Under sub-criterion C(3), consultants to the proposed project are well-qualified local and national experts (e44-45).

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:

The application includes letters of support from partners which detail the relevance to the project and articulate specific task commitments from superintendents and community-based organization partners (e48-50, 64-88) providing clear evidence of meeting sub-criterion D(1).

The proposed project is ambitious and well-designed for statewide and systemic, district and school, and family impact under sub-criterion D(2) with a reasonable cost (e13).

Costs are reasonable to directly serve 2,378 educators, 10,000 families, and 600 family service professionals (e13) in addition to 39 schools as outlined in the management plan (e36-39) and budget (e165-176).

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:

Under CPP2(a) the proposed project includes needs assessments at the administrative (school complex) level to design professional training (e25) and at the school level to develop family engagement plans (e28).

The proposed project employs and expands the family resource center model (e22) and includes robust partnerships with groups who specialize in working with families (e31) to meet students' needs as required under CPP2(b).

The applicant provides a detailed General Education Provisions Act (GEPA) statement on program accessibility (e7) to describe accessibility of approaches required under CPP2(c).

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 program works across early learning, K-12, and juvenile justice systems (e13) as required by CPP3(a).

The applicant proposes to meet CPP3(b) through training for parent advisory councils (e29-30, 34).

CPP3(b)(2) is a strength of the application with multiple strategies for ongoing family and community involvement targeting a high needs population (e19) and working at the systemic level.

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:

CPP4(a) is a strength of this application including a two-generation approach (e23) and a specific program partnership to deliver the Sundays Project (e30-31). The proposed project also includes an expansion of family resource centers to support family well-being needs (e32).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 3

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