

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 05/09/2022 03:59 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Education Northwest (S310A220048)

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 #4 - SFEC Tier 1 Panel - 4: 84.310A

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Education Northwest (S310A220048)

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:

(1) The applicant clearly demonstrated that the project has been developed utilizing research-based evidence as the foundation for the conceptual framework. The applicant indicated that the conceptual framework was created by a workgroup of statewide education and parent representatives, resulting in a research-based, equity centered approach that immediately generated statewide buy-in. The project is grounded in the definition, principles, and practices outlined in the Washington State Family Engagement Framework. The framework is informed by the Dual Capacity-Building Framework (Mapp & Kuttner, 2013) and is designed to be adaptable for diverse community, school, and district contexts. For example, the statewide framework, family engagement is defined as a multi-level system designed for full and equitable partnerships among families, educators, providers, and communities to support learners' development from birth through college and career. WAFEC and its core partners will expand the reach of existing, effective statewide and local family engagement practices and ensure diverse communities have access to evidence-based resources through a multi-level service delivery model. (pgs. 5-8)

(2) The applicant clearly demonstrated that the services to be provided by the proposed project reflect evidence-based from research and best practices. For example, the applicant evidenced that the tiered service delivery model that is informed by research on how families engage and how adults learn. The approach to service delivery builds on the evidence-based Washington State Family Engagement Framework and is designed to help Washington educators, families, and community members create the necessary process and organizational conditions to successfully implement and sustain effective family-school partnerships. For example, the project will offer universal services including a resource hub for Washington state educators and families. Second, the project will offer targeted services including convenings of educators, families, and community partners at the regional and state levels including learning communities and third, the project will offer intensive training and technical assistance for local education agencies (LEAs), parent-led groups, and schools in selecting, implementing, and measuring effectiveness of targeted interventions. (pgs. 9-13)

(3) The applicant adequately demonstrated that the proposed project has design elements that has the potential for building capacity that will extend beyond the grant period. The WAFEC model builds upon the strengths and existing outreach channels of its core partners. For example, the project will gather and curate existing family engagement online learning modules and resources, such as Washington State Family and Community Engagement Trust's online parent and leadership resources and online training and tools from Roots of Inclusion's Inclusionary Practices Family

Engagement Collaborative project. The center will develop additional modules based on identified needs and a centralized resource library. The centralized resource library of training, information, and resources to aid families and students in will increase capacity to advocate for increased inclusion and access for all schools statewide. The federal funding will allow WAFEC to strengthen cross-agency coordination and community engagement; the shared commitment of its partners will embed effective routines and practices and sustain them beyond the life of the funding. (pgs. 13-15)

Weaknesses:

- (1) No weaknesses noted.
- (2) No weaknesses noted.
- (3) No weaknesses noted.

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:

- (1) The applicant provided a detailed management plan that clearly outlines how the project will meet objectives and accomplish milestones in a timely manner. The management plan clearly delineated how the statewide center will operate and the requires roles for partners. The management plan provided a systemic approach for working with multiple partners, including activities, and timelines. For example, the five-year timeline for aligned all activities and tasks with accompanying milestones to create and created an annual timeline designed for the start of each project year. The project will use Smartsheet to track progress on all deliverables, events, and significant milestones for this contract. (pgs. 18-20)
- (2) The applicant provided adequate evidence that there are process and procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement throughout the course of the grant time period. The applicant has ensured meetings and collaborations will take place in a timely manner to review project goals and access data. The process consist of four - steps developed by the called SPUR change process. The four-step are: (1) setting a focus, (2) planning for change, (3)

undertaking change, and (4) recharging and sustaining. During each step, the project and all collaborating partners review all organizational conditions relating to human, procedural, structural, material, and political conditions that are needed to support implementation. (pgs. 20-22)

(3) The applicant clearly demonstrated that various processes and procedures are in place and will be developed for ensuring high-quality products and services are implemented during the project time-period. For example, to ensure high quality, responsive and timely completion of products and services, the applicant has established formal quality-assurance procedures that include regular internal team meetings to discuss completed and upcoming tasks, monitor progress toward timely reporting, identify challenges and create plans to address them, conduct one or more rounds of quality review with internal and external reviewers. Qualitative and qualitative findings will be submitted in draft reports to partners, for a review findings and suggestions to consider alternative conclusions and recommendations. The applicant will additionally utilize the U.S. Department of Education's document Using Evidence to Strengthen Educational Investments (2016) to guide their work. For example, in using this guidance the project will be guided in supporting and evaluating interventions; and examining and reflecting on the process and outcomes of the interventions. (pgs. 23-25)

(4) The applicant clearly delineated the time commitments of the project director and principal investigator and other key project personnel. The given times commitments are reasonable for achieving the objectives of the proposed project. For example, the WAFEC director will take on a half-time role supported by a deputy who will be .23 FTE. In addition, approximately a dozen staff members from EdNW and partner organizations will bring expertise to the project. All partner organizations is committing at least 1.0 FTE dedicated to this project. (pgs.25-24 and Budget Narrative)

(5) The applicant effectively demonstrated that the proposed project will ensure diverse groups bring various perspectives to the planning and implementation of the project. For example, the project will engage an Advisory Board that will include parents, educators, and stakeholders from around the state. The group will center parent voices in the work and support outreach to a diverse, representative network of communities and families across the state. At least 51% of the Board will be parents and family members primarily from the lowest-performing schools. The advisory board will meet three times during the first year and biannually in years 2–5. Advisory committee meetings will serve multiple purposes, including coordination, learning, and sharing. Meetings will ensure coordination among partners, facilitation of joint work, and alignment of key initiatives and activities. (pgs. 26-30)

Weaknesses:

- (1) No weaknesses noted.
- (2) No weaknesses noted.
- (3) No weaknesses noted.
- (4) No weaknesses noted.
- (5) 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:

(1) The applicant clearly addresses the qualifications and experiences of the project director. The applicant indicated that the project was looking for someone with experience managing large statewide projects and experience leading a team. The applicant has selected someone (.5 FTE) as the director of WAFEC. She is the current senior advisor and project lead at EdNW with more than 14 years of experience in leading family engagement. She has a doctorate degree and many years of experience in education and working with school districts. (pg. 31)

(2) The applicant clearly addresses the qualifications of the key project personnel. For example, the project will engage the services (.19 FTE) as a technical assistance advisor for building community and family support systems and engaging youth. She is currently in place with the organization and her areas of expertise include school-community partnership, youth development, and systems-level change. She has extensive experience working with the SEA, LEAs, and community organizations across Washington state. She currently leads the evaluation of Road Map Project Academic Parent Teacher-Teams (APTT) pilot in Seattle Public Schools and Highline Public Schools.

Further another (.10 FTE) person will serve as a technical assistance advisor for building community and family support systems and engaging youth within TEA and Tribal nation schools and Tribal communities. She is a member of the Fort Peck Assiniboine and Sioux Tribes and has nearly 20 years of experience working toward social justice, equity, inclusivity, and cultural responsiveness, particularly in the realm of American Indian education. She has served at the Tribal college, K-12, and state education agency levels across her home state of Montana. Her leadership of the Schools of Promise initiative led to the development of a new model for improving Montana's lowest-performing schools, which were all located on Indian reservations in Montana. (pgs. 31-32)

(3) The applicant addresses the experience level of the project consultants and core partners. The applicant will engage the services of several core partners to bring expertise and support services to the project. Some examples of these partners are: (1) Roots of Inclusion which is an organization that focuses on intersections of systems impacting young people to promote compassion, belonging, and school and life success. The two directors who will guide the work of Roots of Inclusion have formal training in the IDEA and ESSA. Further, the Washington Family Engagement Center Trust is an organization focused on building family leaders and promoting literacy. Executive Director is a committed member of the team bringing experience as a Hispanic bilingual professional. The applicant provided a detailed chart of the partnering consultants in the Appendix, and all will have a role in ensuring the most effective implementation of the project goals. (pgs. 34-38)

Weaknesses:

(1) No weaknesses noted.

(2) No weaknesses noted.

(3) No weaknesses noted.

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:

(1) The applicant clearly demonstrated that the project has amassed numerous commitments from partners to engage in activities support the implementation and success of the project. The applicant provided a table that aligned all of the supports and additional information, such as letters of support and MOUs can found in the Appendix. For example, supports include, agencies and organizations engaging in building capacity with parents and students in developing leadership skills through their Leadership Institutes, (2) developing a resource hub with evidence-based tools from national experts in the field to support family engagement, and providing ongoing communication and technical assistance to parents and organizations that support parents. (pgs. 34-36)

(2) The applicant effectively detailed why the costs are reasonable to meet the objectives and support the project design. In year 1, WAFEC is requesting \$999,040 and the funds will be used to strengthen or build relationships with core partners, advisory board members, and other key stakeholders and to launch services. In the following years, WAFEC is requesting \$999,147 in year 2, \$999,596 in year 3, and \$999,360 in year 4. These funds will be utilized to continue providing targeted supports and comprehensive services to communities of practice and to begin the comprehensive supports for pilot school cohorts that will begin implementing evidence-based family engagement initiatives. At least 65 percent of grant funds will be used to provide targeted and comprehensive services to districts and schools that have the greatest number of disadvantaged students. (pgs. 38-39)

(3) The applicant reasonably evidenced that the costs are reasonable in relation to the number of persons to be served. The applicant indicated that by leveraging existing connections to communities across the state the applicant expect to reach 80 percent of families who have students in the pre-K–12 education system, or 875,464 families. More than 70 percent of the funding will be used for direct project costs for serving students and families, such as training, coaching, convening, and facilitating family-school-community partnerships. The majority of project costs will be directed to those districts, schools, and families most in need of support. Approximately 15 percent of the funds will be used for evaluation tracking progress and outcomes across the five years to collect and assess data to modify services if needed and to target additional high-need communities, schools, and families. (pgs. 39-41)

Weaknesses:

(1) No weaknesses noted.

(2) No weaknesses noted.

(3) 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 clearly demonstrated that the proposed project and the core partners recognize that enormous impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the education system. The pandemic has highlighted the need for effective and equitable family engagement to be in place before a crisis impacts the state. As a result, the proposed services and activities build upon existing Washington state family engagement efforts to respond to emerging needs and long-standing needs exacerbated by the pandemic. (pgs. 3-4)

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 applicant will engage in a statewide asset and opportunity mapping that will be aligned with the statewide framework. The partners will engage in a process to identify, catalog, and visually display community and parent leadership organizations across the state. This database will be continuously updated as they engage with the regional and local family engagement supports and services. Online learning modules and resources. (pgs. 2-3)

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 applicant successfully demonstrated that the proposed Washington Statewide Family Engagement Center (WAFEC) brings together the expertise and partners to successfully bridge the gap between the statewide vision and the resources needed to implement, sustain, and scale it. A collaboration among Education Northwest (EdNW), OSPI, CCER, Roots of Inclusion, and Washington State Family and Community Engagement Trust, WAFEC will build upon, assess, and expand evidence-based family engagement approaches currently deployed statewide. (pgs. 5-6) WAFEC will be led by EdNW, a mission focused organization with deep experience working with state and local education agencies, Tribal nations, and community-based organizations in Washington. OSPI will ensure the work of WAFEC is fully aligned with the emerging statewide family engagement policy framework and infrastructure. The center's community-based partners. (pgs. 6-8)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: **3**

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 05/09/2022 03:59 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 05/09/2022 05:18 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Education Northwest (S310A220048)

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 | 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 #4 - SFEC Tier 1 Panel - 4: 84.310A

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Education Northwest (S310A220048)

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:

- 1) The application clearly indicates that the proposed project will adhere to the Washington State Family Engagement framework, which is informed by the Dual Capacity-Building framework. The conceptual framework evolved out of a working group of statewide education and parent representatives. The framework emphasizes an equity-centered approach. WAFEC will work to establish a statewide collaborative infrastructure to build district, school, educator, and family capacities to develop equitable partnerships to support family-school engagements. (pp. 1-5)
- 2) The application clearly documents that the project will utilize a tiered service delivery model that will include three tiers. Universal supports will include statewide resources and services, such as the resource hub and statewide convenings and communications. Targeted supports will focus on groupings and learning communities. Targeted supports will align content, resources, and activities to fit the needs of SEAs, LEAs, schools, and students. Lastly, intensive supports will include trainings and technical assistance for implementing and scaling evidence-based practices for districts, schools, TEA/Tribal nations, and local leadership. (pp. 6-12)
- 3) As described in the application, the project presents a plan for a sustainable statewide system of support. WAFEC will develop a statewide online and in-person resource hub that will provide universal information, resources, and professional development opportunities to support SEAs, LEAs, schools, educators, families, and communities. The resource hub will continue to provide resources after grant funding subsides. EdNW also notes that they will actively work with the project partners to expand organizational capacity to support ongoing sustainability. (pp. 4-5, 13)

Weaknesses:

- 1) No weaknesses noted.
- 2) No weaknesses noted.
- 3) 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:

1) The application provides a thorough management plan that includes a detailed timeline of the project activities. Specifically, the timeline aligns the objectives with corresponding project activities or milestones by year. The leadership team and project partners will meet regularly (i.e., quarterly after the first year) to discuss project objectives and garner input from the advisory board and evaluator. EdNW has the internal capacity and project and grant management experience to successfully manage grant funds and ensure that the project is moving towards fulfillment of each objective and in a timely manner. EdNW will utilize Smartsheet to track all project deliverables and milestones. (pp. 14-18)

2) The application indicates that EdNW engages their partners in data-evidence cycles to provide for ongoing feedback and continuous improvement. EdNW will employ the SPUR change process, which requires setting a focus, planning for change, undertaking change, and recharging and sustaining. Moreover, the project will employ evidence-based interventions that will assist SEAs, LEAs, and schools with capacity-building. The evaluation of interventions will also serve as a way to provide feedback to the project leadership team. (pp. 18-19)

3) The application provides adequate information to ensure that there are mechanisms in place to confirm that high-quality products and services will result from the project activities. EdNW has an internal control system to provide for formal quality-assurance. Consistent internal team meetings allow for the exchange of information about tasks, monitoring of progress, and conducting quality reviews with both internal and external reviewers. In addition, EdNW regularly solicits feedback from stakeholders and partners as a way to understand what's working and what changes are needed. Furthermore, the core partners have a long history of working with diverse students and families, which will increase the likelihood of shared content and programming activities that align with the populations of focus. (pp. 19-20)

4) The application provides reasonable time commitments for the project director and the deputy director. The project director will contribute 0.5 FTE to the project. The deputy director will contribute .23 to the project. In addition, each core partner will provide one staff member at 1.0 FTE. The application specifies that about a dozen staff members between EdNW and partnering organizations are expected. (p. 20)

5) The application clearly documents how the WAFEC framework will emphasize and support diverse perspectives throughout the grant period. The diversity in partner organizations and collaborations will allow for the exchange of diverse perspectives and feedback loops across entities. WAFEC will convene an advisory group, which will provide another outlet for diverse representation and sharing of perspectives. WAFEC will focus on a diverse array of families, including families in urban and rural locations, children with disabilities, English language learners, and families who have children across multiple levels (pre-K-12). WAFEC will also seek input from students, OSPI members, and organizations that are dedicated to serving disadvantaged students and/or families. (pp. 20-21)

Weaknesses:

- 1) No weaknesses noted.
- 2) No weaknesses noted.
- 3) No weaknesses noted.
- 4) No weaknesses noted.
- 5) 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:

1) The application presents appropriate qualifications for the project director and the deputy director. The project director has a doctorate in Education and more than 14 years of experience in equitable family-school engagement. They currently serve as a senior advisor and project lead at EdNW. The deputy director has a master's degree in Experimental Psychology and more than 25 years of experience in family-school-community partnerships, educational equity, early childhood education, and school improvement. (pp. 21-23, Appendix Resumes)

2) The application provides appropriate qualifications for the technical assistance advisor. Specifically, they have more than 15 years of experience as a program director and internal evaluator with community-based youth development organizations. They also have significant experience working with SEA, LEAs, and community organizations throughout Washington. A second technical assistance advisor will focus on community and family support systems for TEA and Tribal national schools and Tribal communities. The individual in this position is a member of the Fort Peck Assiniboine and Sioux Tribes and has almost 20 years of experience working in the areas of social justice and cultural responsiveness. (pp. 23-24)

3) The application provides a list of subcontractors and their related experience. The subcontractors include the Roots of Inclusion, Washington Family Engagement Center Trust, Community Center for Education Results, Washington Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI), and The Center for the Improvement of Student Learning (CISL). (pp. 24-27) The qualifications of the members of the external evaluation team are included in the Appendix. All members of the team hold doctoral degrees and have relevant professional experiences in research and evaluation. (Appendix)

Weaknesses:

- 1) No weaknesses noted.
- 2) No weaknesses noted.
- 3) No weaknesses noted.

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:

- 1) The application provides extensive information on each of the core partners and their contributions to the project. Memorandums of understanding (MOUs) have been provided by all core partners. Letters of support have been provided by collaborating statewide and regional organizations. The core partners include Education Northwest (EdNW), Washington State Family and Community Engagement Trust, Community Center for Education Results (CCER), Roots of Inclusion, and Washington Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI). (pp. 27-28, Appendix)
- 2) The application thoroughly describes the project costs. The budget appears reasonable and aligns with the project design, objectives, and program activities. WAFEC will serve as a statewide center and will provide universal and targeted services throughout the State. The universal services will include information, tools, and resources in the WAFEC resource hub, as well as professional development and collaboration opportunities. The application declares that at least 65% of grant funds will be used to support disadvantaged students. The budget narrative documents all costs for personnel, including fringe benefits; travel; other direct costs, such as material and supplies, translation services, annual convening, advisory meetings, and regional trainings; contractual costs; occupancy costs of EdNW; and indirect costs. (pp. 29-31, Budget Narrative)
- 3) The application presented in the application and budget narrative are very reasonable considering the project expects to reach 80% of families who have students attending a pre-K-12 education system in the State. Specifically, the applicant plans to reach 875,464 families through communication outreach and engagement activities with established partners. The applicant plans to serve 1,094,330 students from approximately 192 schools. The project will provide these students

with statewide information, resources, and targeted supports. (pp. 1, 29)

Weaknesses:

- 1) No weaknesses noted.
- 2) No weaknesses noted.
- 3) 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:

a) The application clearly indicates that WAFEC's resource hub will create a statewide asset map aligned with OSPI statewide framework. This map will provide for visual display community and parent leadership organizations throughout Washington. A database like this will allow education entities and families to locate local supports and resources. WAFEC's program activities will build upon current family engagement efforts and will serve as a response to needs that have been uncovered by Covid-19. (pp. 5, 7-8)

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:

a) The application clearly explains that the project will address educational equity and adequacy in resources for underserved students attending pre-K-12 schools. For example, the applicant states that it expects to reach 1,094,330 students and 192 schools through statewide information and resources. Furthermore, WAFEC will seek to recruit schools that have been identified for comprehensive or targeted support. (pp. 1-10)

b) The application addresses this Competitive Preference Priority through the development of an advisory board. The advisory board will consist of a majority of parent and family members. The advisory board will review program goals and objectives, feedback from program activities, and evaluation reports in order to provide feedback to the leadership team and core partners to influence project activities and ultimately, district- and school-level decisions and policies. (pp. 15-16)

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:

a) The application fully describes the cross-agency partnerships that will support the program goals, objectives, and activities. Specifically, WAFEC will collaborate with Education Northwest (EdNW), Washington State Family and Community Engagement Trust, Community Center for Education Results (CCER), Roots of Inclusion, and Washington Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI). (pp. 2, 27-29)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 3

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 05/09/2022 05:18 PM