

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 05/06/2022 02:37 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Campus Compact for New Hampshire (S310A220033)

Reader #1: *****

	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	13
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Adequacy of Resources	20	20
Sub Total	80	78
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	87

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - SFEC Tier 1 Panel - 2: 84.310A

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Campus Compact for New Hampshire (S310A220033)

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 applicant has elected to utilize the Dual Capacity Building Framework and The National Network for Partnership Schools' (NNPS) model of six types of family involvement strategies (Epstein, 2019) (e26, p10) as the foundation for its project. As the project is implemented, the applicant will reevaluate barriers to participation and tenets of the framework so that they may address those barriers and move closer to the ideal for parent engagement outlined by the framework (e21, p5). This framework is appropriate for the intentions of the project. The proposed project has also shown a strong grounding in research. As an example, in addition to the selected framework, the applicant has adhered to the learning approach of the Global Family Research Project (formerly the Harvard Family Research Project), which is based on decades of research exhibiting effectiveness of integrated supports in promoting children's learning and contributing to their school success (e24, p8). The project will also work to train parents as leaders, as recommended by the research of O'Donough & Punch (2003), and in organizing that engages families to focus on school performance/accountability (Lopez & Kreider, 2003) (e25, p9).

The applicant has proposed a rich project likely to build the capacity of educators and families. The applicant will provide incentivized learning and leadership opportunities for parents and opportunities for peer-to-peer learning through parent villages, small parent groups who come together to foster community, forge collective identity and leave inspired to fight for change. This research-based curriculum "facilitates conversations within small groups of parents in local communities, and champions parents as their children's primary brain architect, first teacher, lifetime advocate, and coach. The project will also provide pathways for parents to lead with benefits including micro-credentials and paid service (e27, p11). The introduction of online resources for families; modules for parents and LEAs; a new evidence-based curriculum informed by best practices for educators; and statewide convenings sharing best practices from the project (e28, p12) will also be outcomes, designed to further build capacity for parents and educators through this project.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

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 applicant has included detailed timelines for curriculum development and program implementation that include clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones (e34, p18). Both timelines make it highly likely that the project will be completed on time and within budget, if implemented as written.

A robust plan for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement has also been provided. The plan includes obtaining annual feedback through focus groups, interviews, and surveys from a variety of stakeholders (families, staff, school personnel, partners) on program & services, and regularly collecting and analyzing data from debriefings, as well as pre- and post-tests (e35, p19).

Mechanisms of the continuous improvement plan, such as feedback through annual focus groups, interviews, and surveys from a variety of stakeholders (families, staff, school personnel, partners), will also help ensure high-quality services as the feedback is gathered and incorporated into the program. The operation of two Regional Family Engagement sites also supports the applicant in more effectively focusing on areas of highest need in each community, as they develop, pilot, and refine the developed curricula (e37, p21). Services to parents and educators will also be continually evaluated using facilitated debriefings, surveys, and pre-/post-tests (e35,19).

The time commitments of the principal investigator and project director are both adequate and appropriate for the project. The principal investigator will dedicate 20% of their time to the project, while the project director will devote 100% (e39, p23).

In addition to collecting diverse perspectives through the annual surveys, focus groups and interviews noted above, the project's advisory council will include 40+ parents, educational experts (10), students (5), SEA representatives (2), LEAs (10), businesses (3), and other partners, including CBOs (e32, p16). Among this group will be students of diverse backgrounds and abilities, early childhood care professionals; teachers; community organizations serving racially and ethnically diverse students and refugee students and families; non-English speaking populations; adult educators, postsecondary education representatives, college access outreach programs, school administrators, business representatives, and representatives from the New Hampshire Department of Education (e40, p24).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

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 training and experience of the project director, principal investigator, key personnel and contractors are clearly detailed in the narrative and relevant to the project. The identified principal investigator has 20+ years' experience working with NH students and families and a large national portfolio of grant projects. The PI also holds an undergraduate degree in political science, a master's degree in Public Administration, and is completing a Doctorate in Education (e41, p25). The project director will be required to hold at least a master's degree in Educational Administration or a related field, and have a minimum 10 years' experience in personnel, program, and fiscal management; demonstrated experience with federal grant management; and demonstrated knowledge and leadership in parent engagement, among other things. Preference will be given to candidates with lived experience working with families and communities from low-income and marginalized populations (e42, 26).

The instructional designer and trainers are two examples of the project's key personnel. Their identified qualifications are also aptly suited for the project. The instructional designer will be required to have a master's degree in education or a related field, at least five years as a curriculum developer and 10 years in education, family engagement, outreach/wrap-around services, or a similar field, among other things (e43, p27). Trainers will be required to have a bachelor's degree in education or related field and at least five years as a trainer of educators and/or parents focused on improving educational outcomes (e44, p28).

PRI and Bellwether are two key consultants for the project. Both have extensive experience relevant to the project. PRI has decades' experience builds partnerships at the regional and national level to enhance support from governmental and philanthropic sources for all rural communities. and Bellwether is a national nonprofit focused on changing education and life outcomes for underserved children (e45, p29)

Weaknesses:

The applicant has indicated that, "All things being equal, preference will be given to persons who are members of traditionally underrepresented groups based on race, color, national origin, gender, age or disability," (e41, p25) and that preference will be given to a project director with the lived experience of project participants (e42, 26) but it is not clear how applications from diverse, underrepresented candidates will be encouraged.

Reader's Score: 13

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 applicant has provided a clear table (e47, p31) and letters of commitment (e108) regarding the relative commitments of each partner. Partners have all demonstrated a strong and relevant commitment to the project. Costs for the project appear reasonable and aligned to the program's objectives. With a plan to serve over 167, 910 students (e49, p33), the cost per student is less than \$6 per year (e50, p34), making it also reasonable in relation the number of students served.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

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:

The applicant will work with the New Hampshire Department of Education and their evaluators (Bellwether) to design and conduct a statewide needs assessment on the impact of COVID-19 on students in the first year of the project. As needs are identified, an asset map of available resources, include resources to meet students' food, health, safety, academic and social emotional needs, will be created. (e31, p15).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

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 will cover birth to career and include building capacity in K-12 LEAs (e26, p10). Through asset mapping and a needs assessment, and using disaggregated data related to needs and resources, the applicant will actively address inequities in resources. The project will also include regional centers to support urban, suburban and rural families and students. They will also support parents in identifying barriers to equitable access to opportunities, brainstorming solutions, and connecting them to evidence-based practices, and peer leaders to assist in reducing identified barriers to equitable access (e31, p15).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

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 proposed project will partner with other NH initiatives that can align and share resources (e.g., AmeriCorps), and partners, such as postsecondary organizations, that can provide opportunities like micro credentials to families (e46, p30).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 3

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 05/06/2022 02:37 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 05/05/2022 01:38 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Campus Compact for New Hampshire (S310A220033)

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	14
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Adequacy of Resources	20	19
Sub Total	80	78
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	87

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - SFEC Tier 1 Panel - 2: 84.310A

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Campus Compact for New Hampshire (S310A220033)

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 applicant clearly outlines the key framework for their project, the Dual Capacity-Building Framework (DCBF), which undergirds their strategy to build capacity both for parents and educators (e20-22). The applicant used the DCBF as the foundational frame and draws on evidence-based practices and research, such as the Global Family Research Project and Joyce Epstein's parent involvement research. They also specifically tie these pieces of research to their project activities (e24-27). A key goal of the SFEC is to develop infrastructure within the SEA to increase their activities and ability to support LEAs in the long term (e20). An example is working with the SEA to establish a family engagement framework (e28). A key objective in the application is also building parent voice and advocacy so that they can support and advocate for systems change in the long term (e27-29).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted in this section.

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 applicant provides a clear timeline for year 1 that they expect to be similar for the following years. This table breaks down the activities and responsibilities by week, month, quarter, and monthly milestones (e33-25). The applicant provides clear mechanisms for internal and external feedback for continuous improvements, such as data collection during their monthly activities, assessment during their quarterly activities, staff evaluations, and advisory council reports (Figure 4, e35-36). The applicants define how each organization will work to ensure quality products and services while also providing an outline. This includes a pilot approach to their curriculum development and implementation (e36-37). The applicant lists their services clearly, including providing support for families, SEA and LEAs, comprehensive training, outreach for targeted populations, policy, and systems-level initiatives ((e127-128). The applicant provides sufficient staff time allocation for the PI, PD, and other project staff. The PI is the only staff with less than 100%, which is appropriate, given the amount of other staff and the size of the region (e39-40). The applicant will establish an advisory council with the majority of parents, education professionals, school representatives, students, representatives from SEA, LEAs, and the business community. They also set up multiple ways for stakeholders to provide feedback on the project, such as providing direction to grant planning and informing policy recommendations (e17, e40, e128).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted in this section.

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 qualifications, training, and experiences of hired staff and consultants are sufficiently outlined in the application. For example, the PI has spent more than twenty years working with students and families and grant management experience. For unfilled positions, there is a clear plan for hiring and requirements for those open positions. For example, job descriptions with responsibilities, training, and experience required for the Instructional Designer, Program Associate, Project Director, Site Coordinator, and Trainer are included in the application (e41 – 46, e59-68).

Weaknesses:

While the application does mention an effort to recruit a diverse staff (e41), there are insufficient details to recognize whether this effort will be effective.

Reader's Score: 14

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 partner organizations (e109 – 119) and an MOU draft between Partners for Rural Impact and the Campus Compact for New Hampshire (e126-134) that outlines their roles and responsibilities. The applicant also provides clear responsibilities for external partners (Figure 6, e47). The applicant includes a budget that clearly supports the activities and objectives of the SFEC Budget narrative (e49, e138-147). They also intend to provide “pathways for parents to lead that includes micro-credentials and paid service” (e27). The applicant intends to serve 167,910 children and their families across 21 school districts in 3 counties and the City of Manchester (e13-14, e49-50). They indicate that “the cost per student is less than \$6 per year,” which means efficient use of funds, given the impact (e50).

Weaknesses:

There is only minimal evidence that the SFEC will provide adequate compensation and/or supports for family and student participation in activities such as advisory committees (travel reimbursement, stipends, child care, etc.). Without this compensation, it may be difficult for the SFEC to meet its objectives for family participation and, therefore, lessen the project's significance.

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 will work with their evaluation partners to conduct a statewide needs assessment and asset mapping for students in both urban and rural communities to “determine levels of disengagement from learning among populations related to COVID-19 impacts” (e13-14, e20). They intend to “consider multiple populations, including rural and urban, ethnicity/race/color, English learners, and low income (e31). Specifically, the applicant is focused on two underserved rural regions of the state (e18).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted in this section.

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 applicant describes their target populations as early learning, elementary, middle, high school, and post-secondary (e14, e31). As outlined in the draft MOU, the applicant will provide parent leadership training (e130-132). Specifically, one of the goals of the project is to “increase parent skills, confidence, and voice,” with a sub-objective to “increase the # of parents in leadership and service roles . . .” (e23).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted in this section.

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 project is based on a consortium model between the Campus Compact for New Hampshire (CCNH) and Partners for Rural Impact (PRI) (e14-15, e32). They plan to leverage their advisory council, which includes “40+ parents, educational experts (10), students (5), SEA representatives (2), LEAs (10), businesses (3), and other partners, including CBOs” (e32).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted in this section.

Reader's Score: **3**

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 05/05/2022 01:38 PM