

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 04/28/2022 08:27 AM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** National Center for Families Learning (S310A220047)

**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	20
<b>Quality of Project Personnel</b>		
1. Project Personnel	15	13
<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 #1: \*\*\*\*\*

Applicant: National Center for Families Learning (S310A220047)

## 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 applicant provides a comprehensive logic model (e25) that is further broken out in narrative (e27) of objectives, activities, and outputs. The project is based on the Dual-Capacity Building Framework (e26). The applicant lists the overarching concerns that the project is designed to address (K-3 reading loss, mental health, disengagement, and adult education) on e23.

Criterion A2: The applicant includes cited references from the What Works Clearinghouse database on e146-147. A complete bibliography of cited references from up-to-date research and practice is provided on e85-86. The offerings of trainings, workshops, and activities are fully described on e74-80.

Criterion A3: The applicant has built gradual transference of support for services to the State of Colorado (e40) into the framework and timeline, as well as the budget (e149), with the agreement of the Colorado Boards of Cooperative Educational Services. The letter of support from the Governor of Colorado (e87) indicates that the proposed project will build capacity and yield results with subsequent funding beyond the grant period.

#### 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:**

Criterion B1: The applicant provides (e42-43) a clear table of objectives, timelines and milestones related to the stated deliverables for the project.

Criterion B2: On e44-45, the applicant provides a detailed table of feedback that will be gathered and incorporated weekly, monthly, quarterly, and annually.

Criterion B3: The applicant lists three key mechanisms for ensuring high-quality products and services: the confidence that the materials are founded in research, ongoing access to and interaction with the professional learning, and the ongoing independent evaluation measures.

Criterion B4: In the organizational chart on e46 and further information on e81-84, the applicant effectively demonstrates that time commitments are appropriate and adequate.

Criterion B5: On e48, the applicant provides a detailed list of the components of the advisory committee: 50%+ Parents (parents of disadvantaged students, students with disabilities, grandparents, English language learners); Youth/Family Engagement and out-of-school time representation from statewide and local nonprofit organizations; Higher education representation from community colleges and universities; Family and community engagement; Local business representation from Colorado Strategic Family Engagement Center regions; Philanthropic representation from grant makers; Colorado workforce development agencies; Community organizations in the health or economic justice space.

**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:**

Criterion C1: The qualifications of the project director (e107) are appropriate to the project. The project director has directed the scaling-up of international educational initiatives with National Geographic, among other qualifications detailed on e49.

Criterion C2: The appropriate time commitments and qualifications of all key project personal are provided on e50-52. Historically underrepresented groups are represented. The GEPA statement on e7-8 details an emphasis on seeking applicants for employment who have been historically underrepresented.

Criterion C3: The narratives detailing the qualifications of each partner and consultant are listed in pages e52-57. The relevant training and experience of each are explicitly described, and appropriate.

**Weaknesses:**

Criterion C2: The qualifications, relevant training, and experience of the unhired project director and learning specialists are difficult to adequately assess. It is unclear that historically underrepresented groups will be encouraged to apply because there is no job description included.

**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:**

Criterion D1: The applicant includes robust letters of commitment (e87-95) from the Governor and school districts to indicate commitment and partnership. Letters of commitment from partner consultants are also included.

Criterion D2: The detailed budget on e149 clearly articulates and breaks out appropriate costs for training, resources, and support. The costs in all budget categories are reasonable and appropriate.

Criterion D3: The materials and trainings (e59) will be available and replicable throughout Colorado past the grant period in a Train the Trainer approach. The costs break down to \$208 per individual, which is reasonable.

**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:**

CPP2a: The applicant proposes supports that build the capacity of families, schools, and communities to address learning recovery and related impacts from the COVID-19 pandemic, as well as practices and systems necessary to improve student development and family well-being. The applicant will administer a 2022 and 2025 statewide COVID-19 needs assessment to identify and track regional and state trends in COVID-19 impact on students, families, educators, and faculty (e28).

CPP2b: The applicant proposes regional teacher training activities and high-impact local education agency efforts to provide resources and supports to meet the basic, fundamental, health and safety needs of students and educators (e37).

CPP2c: The project's commitment to co-creation will cultivate an inclusive space for special advisory committee governance where parents are partners (e47).

**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:**

CPP3a: The project will identify goals to increase educational equity, adequacy in resources, and opportunity for underserved students in one or more educational settings including early learning, elementary school, middle school, high school, and career and technical education (e33).

CPP3b1: The project work of participating education agencies and regional hubs establish, expand, and improve the engagement of underserved students and families to inform and make decisions that influence policy and practice specifically in Alamosa; Denver; Greeley-Evans School District 6; Mesa County Valley School District 51; Pueblo School District (e37-38).

**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: The proposed project strengthens cross-agency coordination and active relationships with multiple state agencies (e.g., CDE, Colorado Department of Higher Education, Colorado Workforce Development Council), the Governor's Office, state associations, state and regional funding partners, and family- and equity-centered advocacy organizations (e38).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses found.

**Reader's Score: 3**

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 04/28/2022 08:27 AM



Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 04/28/2022 10:29 AM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** National Center for Families Learning (S310A220047)

**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	20
<b>Quality of Project Personnel</b>		
1. Project Personnel	15	12
<b>Adequacy of Resources</b>		
1. Adequacy of Resources	20	20
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>77</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>86</b>

# Technical Review Form

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

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

Applicant: National Center for Families Learning (S310A220047)

## 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 includes activities at multiple levels of impact, state, regional, district and school, and family and is well-demonstrated (e24-25) under sub-criterion A(1). Further, the proposed project's conceptual framework includes important alignment to the Colorado P-20 framework and toolkit for family, school, and community engagement (e22).

Under sub-criterion A(2), the proposed project reflects up-to-date research and practice including the Family Literacy Model (e34-35).

The application includes intentional design to build capacity and hand off project resources to local partners (e40-41) under sub-criterion A(3) and a train-the-trainer model for districts (e22-23) to build capacity at that level.

#### 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 clearly and completely describes a plan that includes a project timeline with milestones and defined responsibilities (e42-43).

The application describes a strong continuous improvement procedure (e43-45) under sub-criterion B(2).

The application includes a set of core services at districts (e74-79) and a menu of options (e78-80) that will ensure high quality services (e35-36) with staff support for implementation (e45-46) under sub-criterion B(3).

Time commitments are appropriate (e47, e81-84) as required by sub-criterion B(4), and they reduce as the project progresses and capacity is built at the local level.

Per sub-criterion B(5), the advisory council includes diverse perspectives (e28, e47-48).

**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 project director in the proposed project is well-qualified (e49) under sub-criterion C(1).

Current key project personnel are well-qualified (e50-52) under sub-criterion C(2).

Under sub-criterion C(3), consultants to the proposed project are qualified experts (e52-55).

**Weaknesses:**

Under sub-criterion C(2), the applicant discusses hiring three new positions (e81, e153), but does not include job descriptions. Without job descriptions it is difficult to determine the qualifications for these important in-state roles.

**Reader's Score: 12**

**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 a description of partners (e55-57) and preliminary Memorandums of Understanding (MOUs) and letters of support (appendices E, e87 and F, e96) which detail the relevance to the project and commitments from the state, the school districts, and community-based organization partners as required by sub-criterion D(1).

The proposed project is statewide in impact with intensive work in five districts, and includes reasonable costs (e58) under sub-criterion D(2).

Costs are reasonable as outlined in the table of persons served (e32) and budget (e149) under 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:**

Under CPP2(a) the proposed project includes reference to a statewide needs inventory early in the pandemic (e23) and plans to repeat the inventory twice in the grant period (e27). Additionally, the project includes plans for asset maps and three regional hubs (e30) and a statewide landscape analysis of policies (e29).

The design includes use of Five Protective Factors (e37) to support basic needs of students and their families under CPP2(b).

**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 K-12 systems in multiple ways (e32) with five districts targeted for direct support (e38) as required by CPP3(a). It includes adult learning through the family literacy model (e33-34).

CPP3(b)(1) is a strength of the application with aligned strategies for improving the engagement of community members in decision-making at the school, district, and statewide levels (e25), and use of a co-creation approach to support families' leadership (e38).

**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 plans to convene the consortium of key partners as well as other agencies (e38-39) to improve services in state agencies that serve families' well-being needs per CPP4(a).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses found.

**Reader's Score:** 3

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 04/28/2022 10:29 AM