

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 05/06/2022 03:14 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Parent Institute for Quality Education (S310A220019)

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

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

# Technical Review Form

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

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

Applicant: Parent Institute for Quality Education (S310A220019)

## 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 successfully demonstrated that the proposed project has aligned its conceptual framework with research and evidence-based activities. For example, the project will incorporate the Dual Capacity-Building Framework and What Works Clearinghouse evidence in educator and family facing programming. The project will provide evidence-based technical assistance to school personnel. The project design is based on research that shows that robust family engagement achieved by providing professional development and technical assistance to educators can improve educational outcomes and student achievement (Mapp and Bergman, 2021). In alignment with the framework the project believes that families must be active partners in their children's education through collaborative partnerships between families and schools. (pgs. 10-13)

(2) The applicant effectively demonstrated that the proposed services to be provided by the project reflects up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice. For example, the project is aligned with services that are centered on moving families up the Parent Involvement Continuum, from passive recipients of information to active partners in the educational process. The applicant has a family engagement curriculum based on several theories that demonstrate that family engagement is a beneficial practice for the achievement and behavioral outcomes of all students, including social capital theory. In addition, the applicant discusses how the project will model the works of Dr. Joyce Epstein's--Six Types of Family Involvement that are instrumental to a child's development and their school and educational success. One of the main focuses of the project will be training and technical assistance (TA) to educators. Using PIQE's National Best Practices Model, they will provide training to assist participants with develop policies and implement programs designed to increase family engagement in schools. (pgs. 14-18)

(3) The applicant adequately demonstrated that the proposed project is likely to build capacity and yield results that has the potential to extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance. For example, the applicant will engage in numerous trainings and technical assistance with the LEAs. These trainings will build capacity of both school personnel and families as well as for the field in general, creating additional resources, evidence, and collaboration around enhancing family engagement. Districts are able to modify and adjust the curriculum to meet local district needs. Each year of the project, three LEAs and three COEs will be identified to expand the implementation of the TA. Technical assistance will be designed to build capabilities, connections, cognition, and confidence that in turn will build the capacity of families to engage in effective family-school partnerships that support student achievement and school improvement.

The Family Engagement logic model has been embedded throughout the programming of both with families and educators, working to empower families, assist educators with developing and implementing effective communication strategies, and engaging families in the greater school community. (pgs. 18-22)

**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 reasonable management plan that outlines how they proposed to achieve the objectives of the project on time. The plan explained the lines of responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks. For example, the SFEC project will be led by a team of experienced professionals who will oversee the project, by providing leadership and fiscal oversight throughout the grant period to ensure that all objectives are achieved. (pgs. 19-21)
- (2) The applicant provided a detailed alignment of the process and procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement throughout the grant period. For example, the project will collaborate with partners through processes of reviewing and integrating state and local policies, existing family engagement initiatives, and state academic standards, and identifying parent needs to determine how to best embed the SFEC into the state system. The staff will convene COEs, LEAs, and school leaders on a monthly basis to check in on the implementation of programming and technical assistance, share findings and best practices, and work through challenges. The advisory committee will play a key role in providing feedback and identifying areas of improvement. The evaluator and staff will use the Liaison Model for

interacting with the project partners and staff through monthly check-ins using soft touch emails and telephone calls, as well as the mandatory monthly meetings that will garner feedback and information on program implementation. (pgs. 21-22)

(3) The applicant effectively demonstrated that processes and procedures are in place for ensuring high-quality products and services are derived from the project. For example, project leadership will use established, evidence based best practices around family engagement. All trainings and materials will be carefully evaluated for cultural and linguistic appropriateness and will be reviewed by all partners and the advisory committee members. A policies and procedures manual will be created for the project to cover areas where issues are anticipated, thus standardizing responses and protocols, and then codified in the manual. (pgs. 23-25)

(4) The applicant reasonably provided clarification on the time commitments of the project director and principal investigator and other key project personnel. For example, the Principal Investigator, and the VP of Program and Impact, will dedicate 25% of their time to overseeing the project. Additionally, a professional development associate (1 FTE) will be responsible for developing and providing training, technical assistance and outreach activities to families and professionals to support family engagement. In the budget narrative, the applicant indicated that the to-be-hired project director will be a fulltime position. (pgs. 25-26)

(5) The applicant provided strong evidence that ensures diverse perspectives of the project operation are embedded in the proposed project. For example, the applicant will form a SFEC Advisory Committee, which will include caregivers, educators, students, SEA, LEA representatives, and community members. To recruit participants, the project will use its existing networks of families and educators, leverage relationships with key partners, and conduct outreach through established groups. The SFEC Director will be responsible for convening and overseeing the advisory committee, which will meet quarterly to report on implementation progress. This committee will convene quarterly and will assist in program development, product creation, implementation, program improvement, and evaluation. The applicant indicated that they will ensure that all stakeholders have a voice in the project using participant polls, focus groups, key informant interviews, and our semi-annual survey/needs assessment of all families and educators. (pgs. 27-29)

#### **Weaknesses:**

(1) The applicant provided limited information on the management plan. The limited information leaves questionable gaps in the timeline; thus, it is difficult to determine the adequacy for meeting the milestones.

(2) No weaknesses noted

(3) No weaknesses noted.

(4) No weaknesses noted.

(5) No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 18**

#### **Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel**

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

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

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

**principal investigator.**

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

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

**Strengths:**

(1) The applicant provided the qualifications, training and experience needed for the project director or principal investigator. The applicant already has in place the Principal Investigator and this person serves as Vice President of Program and Impact. They hold both a Bachelor's degrees and Master's degree with further training in the Non-Profit Resilient Leaders program. They are currently a doctoral candidate in Organizational Leadership. They have overseen PIQE's Family Engagement Programs in prior years.

The project will hire an SFEC Director to oversee the project who demonstrates understanding of family engagement and its impact on school success and family wellbeing. The minimum requirements include a bachelor's degree or equivalent, project management experience, an understanding of Family Engagement frameworks and its importance to effective education of youth, and significant training experience. (pgs. 23-25)

(2) The applicant sufficiently provided the qualifications, training, and experiences of key project personnel. For example, the Professional Development Associate, who will report to the SFEC Director will have at least a Master's degree and knowledge of and experience working with diverse families, educators, and administrators. (pgs. 24-25)

(3) The applicant indicated reasonably the qualifications, relevant training, and experiences, of project consultants or subcontractors. For example, project consultants and subcontractors include the Director of Family Engagement at CDE, who will serve as the liaison to the project. She has more than 20 years of experience facilitating, coordinating, and developing innovative strategic approaches to complex community problems.

The Senior Director of Research and Policy will represent NAFSCE on the CA SFEC. She will be responsible for consulting with PIQE and partner schools to provide individual TA. She is a longtime community advocate who supports education, leadership development, and capacity-building in the Latino community.

The external evaluation will be led by the Dean of the School of Education from the University of California (UC) at Irvine. She has more than 15 years of administrative experience at UC San Diego and the University of Washington's College of Education, where she directed the higher education program. She has a bachelor's degree, a master's degree from Harvard University and a Ph.D. in education from Stanford. (pgs. 25-27)

**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 applicant provided evidence that they have secured the support of numerous partners. For example, this evidence can be found in the Appendices through MOUs and letters of support for the proposed project. Some of the supports include, training, technical assistance, school space for meetings. (pgs. 27-29 and the Appendices)

(2) The applicant provided adequate evidence the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project. For example, the applicant indicated that the costs of the project are directly related to the objectives and are aligned with the number of persons to be served. The applicant assures that the project will use at least 65% of the funds in each fiscal year to serve LEAs, schools, and CBOs that serve high concentrations of disadvantaged students, including ELs, minorities, student with disabilities, homeless children and youth, children and youth in foster care, and migrant students. They also indicated that they will also use at least 30 percent of funds received for each fiscal year to establish or expand technical assistance for evidence-based family education programs. Based on review of the budget narrative the project has utilized funds to meet the needs of the project. (pgs. 29-30 and the Budget Narrative)

(3) The applicant sufficiently addressed the fact that the costs are reasonable in relation to the number of persons to be served and the anticipated results and benefits. For example, the applicant indicated that the project will reach approximately 480 families and through programming, for a total of 2,400 families and 750 educators throughout the course of the grant. (pgs. 30-31)

**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 provided some evidence to indicated that the proposed project will respond to the wide-spread impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic. The applicant indicated that the project will align their work around mitigating those impacts over the past two years, the project will aim to address the impact of COVID-19 on, students, educators, faculty, and families. Harnessing family engagement to reduce social isolation and learning loss and focus on the communities hit hardest by the pandemic to promote equity in student and family access to educational resources and opportunities. (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 reasonably address the fact that the proposed project will engage in developing a statewide family engagement framework and provide family engagement technical assistance for selected LEAs and COEs. For example, the project will select six LEAs and six COEs in rural, urban, and suburban districts each year based on the needs of the schools, districts, and the student population. Selected schools will have a high percentage of underserved students, including English learners (ELs), low-income students, and students of color. ELs are a significant portion of California public school students, at 17.7% of the student population, and the majority of California's students come from families with incomes of less than 185% of the federal poverty level and qualify for free- and reduced-price meals. Other evidence include the fact that almost 73% of California students are youth of color. The project will serve a total of 480 families per year and will target schools serving high concentrations of EL and migrant students. (pgs. 4-8)

**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 effectively demonstrated that the proposed project has and will continue to establish cross-agency partnerships and community-based partnerships. The project is an outcome of the fact that in 2020, the State Superintendent created the first ever family engagement office within the California Department of Education (CDE) to facilitate statewide leadership, guidance, and support in the area of family engagement and youth development in order to build the capacity of educators and parents to establish effective home-school partnerships to improve student outcomes. The project will continue to build a cohesive statewide approach that of a Community Engagement Initiative designed

deliver on California's promise of a quality, equitable education for every student by working collaboratively with other state agencies, partner agencies, county offices of education and stakeholders to address the most pressing needs of California's local educational agencies (LEAs). (pgs. 8-9)

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score:**     **3**

---

**Status:**           Submitted

**Last Updated:**   05/06/2022 03:14 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 05/06/2022 04:12 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Parent Institute for Quality Education (S310A220019)

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	16
<b>Quality of Project Personnel</b>		
1. Project Personnel	15	15
<b>Adequacy of Resources</b>		
1. Adequacy of Resources	20	20
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>76</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>85</b>

# Technical Review Form

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

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

Applicant: Parent Institute for Quality Education (S310A220019)

## 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) A clear conceptual framework is identified and described in detail. Additional relevant theories and models are discussed and linked to the program design and components. Appropriate references and citations are included. Specifically, the applicant will center their work around the Parent Involvement Continuum, which encourages parents to become active partners in their children's education and school life. Other theories that contributed to the framework are Social Capital Theory, Overlapping Spheres of Influence, Types of Family Involvement, and The Hoover-Dempsey and Sandler model. Furthermore, the applicant will utilize the Dual Capacity-Building Framework to guide the development of family engagement strategies and programs. (pp. 9-11)
- 2) The applicant provides a detailed description of the six types of family engagement technical assistance and training programs that will be implemented throughout the project. Specifically, the project will address parenting, including a social emotional learning (SEL) program and literacy and math, two-way communication channels between families and schools, volunteering in the school community, children's education at home, technical assistance to help schools improve school culture and identify mechanisms to engage families, and collaboration with community partners. (pp. 11-13)
- 3) As documented in the application, the proposed project will link a variety of educational and family engagement organizations. The applicant will provide for capacity building of school personnel, families, and the field of family engagement, which will allow for results that continue beyond the duration of the grant. (pp. 14-16)

#### 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) No strengths noted.

2) There is a clear plan to collect data regarding program feedback and to utilize the data to make continuous improvements to the program activities. PIQE will consider state and local policies, current family engagement initiatives, academic standards, and parent needs in order to embed SFEC into the state system. Monthly meetings with CA SFEC, COEs, LEAs, and school leaders will help determine best practices and allow for whole-group feedback when discussing challenges. Additionally, the Advisory Committee will provide feedback for consideration. Regular check-ins with the evaluator will provide an ongoing feedback loop of information regarding program activities. (pp. 23-25)

3) High-quality projects and services are expected given the evidence-based and evidence-informed technical assistance and training programs and evaluation plan. The project partners will be involved with the selection of all training materials to ensure cultural and linguistic alignment with the intended populations. (pp. 25-26)

4) Time commitments are appropriate for the project director and additional staff, as the project will employ 19 personnel, including a full-time Project Director. The director will oversee all program implementation. In addition, the program investigator will allot .25 FTE to oversee the project, which will include collaboration with the evaluation team. The professional development associate will provide 1.0 FTE, and will support family engagement through developing training materials and providing technical assistance and outreach. (pp. 26, e154-e155)

5) It is evident from the application that diverse perspectives will be encouraged and solicited through representation on the advisory committee, as well as through ongoing program evaluation efforts. This will occur through the development of a diverse Advisory Committee, which will include families, state agencies, LEAs, educators, and community members. The committee will provide insight into program development, product creation, program implementation, program improvement, and evaluation. Ongoing surveys, focus groups, polls, and key informant interviews will help ensure all voices are being heard and considered. (pp. 26-27)

**Weaknesses:**

- 1) The timeline does not include a range of time for each task (i.e., month to month). The key tasks in the timeline do not provide enough details to get a full understanding of each task and activity that is mentioned earlier in the application. (pp. 23-24)
- 2) No weaknesses noted.
- 3) No weaknesses noted.
- 4) No weaknesses noted.
- 5) No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 16**

**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 provides a thorough description of the Project Director's relevant training and professional experience, and includes responsibilities for the proposed project role. Specifically, the application documents that a bachelor's degree, project management experience, and understanding of family engagement frameworks are required. The principal investigator is a doctoral candidate in organizational leadership and holds a master's degree. They have completed a training program in Non-profit Resilient Leaders. (p. 29)
- 2) Additional key project personnel are clearly identified in the application, along with their educational and/or related experience. Resumes/CVs are included for the identified project staff. The project will hire a professional development associate who will have at least a master's degree and experience working with diverse families and educators. Additionally, the external evaluator has a doctoral degree in education and has extensive experience conducting research on diversity and access across all educational levels. (pp. 29-31, e72-e117)
- 3) The application clearly identifies and describes the qualifications and experience of the Project Consultants and subcontractors. Project consultants include a representative from CDE with more than 20 years of experience working to develop approaches to navigate community problems and working with parent engagement groups. A representative from NAFSCE's will serve as a consultant for PIQE and partner schools. They have significant experience working with Latinos, ELL, and in the areas of education and community wellness. They also hold a law degree (JD). (pp. 30-31)

**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 includes a list of committed project partners, as well as MOUs and/or letters of commitment from each identified partner. The primary partners include CDE, NAFSCE, an evaluator from the University of California at Irvine, and LEAs. CDE will serve in a collaborative aspect, in that they will be responsible for connecting project activities to statewide initiatives and building infrastructure to support technical assistance for LEAs. NAFSCE will also support technical assistance for CA SFEC. (pp. 31-33, e68-e71, e118-e146)
- 2) Project costs are clearly articulated in narrative form and appear reasonable. Project costs align with the program design and overarching goals and objectives. The application clearly notes that 65% of grant funds will be used to serve LEAs, schools, and CBOs that focus on disadvantaged students, ELL students, minorities, students with disabilities, home youth, youth in foster care, and migrant students. Furthermore, 30% of grant funds will be used to establish or expand technical assistance for family engagement programs. Funding has been allotted to cover 19 staff positions. (pp. 34, e154-e159)
- 3) The application clearly documents that the project will serve a total of 2,400 families and 750 educators over five years. These numbers support the notion that costs are reasonable and that the results and benefits outweigh the projected costs. (pp. 34-35, e154-e159)

**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:

c) The application clearly documents that the applicant will address the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic by providing social emotional learning (SEL) program supports to families to address students' SEL and academic needs. Additionally, the applicant will provide digital literacy training to improve computer and online learning skills in families, which will support the reengagement of underserved students. (p. 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) As presented in the application, the applicant will promote equity in student access to educational resources by prioritizing English language learners (ELL) and migrant families in elementary schools, middle schools, and high schools for family engagement programming. The application clearly describes a focus on digital literacy and broadband access for families, which will further support equitable access to resources and opportunities. (pp. 7-8)

b) There is a clear plan for cross-agency collaboration, as the application clearly states the applicant will partner with California Department of Education (CDE) and NAFSCE to increase collaborative efforts with state education agencies (SEAs), local education agencies (LEAs), and community-based organizations (CBOs) to build capacity for schools with a high percentage of underserved students. Specifically, PIQE will partner with LEAs to deliver programming for ELL and migrant families. PIQE will provide technical assistance to educators in order to improve culturally responsive practices. Parent leaders will be encouraged to engage in school policy development and participate in the family engagement conference. (pp. 5, 7-9).

**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 applicant details a well-constructed plan to partner with CDE, National Association for Family, School, and Community Engagement (NAFSCE), LEAs, CBOs, and other cross-agencies, which will allow for a multi-pronged approach to reach and improve outcomes for underserved students. The application includes letters of commitment and memorandums of understanding (MOUs) as confirmation of these planned partnerships. Specifically, PIQE will work with CDE and NAFSCE to expand collaboration with LEAs and CBOs. They will also work to develop a Family Engagement Framework that will include input from statewide stakeholders. Furthermore, PIQE will plan a statewide family engagement conference that will engage multiple agencies. (pp. 5-9, e68-e71, e118-e146)

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 3**

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 05/06/2022 04:12 PM