

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 04/28/2022 01:05 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: The Keystone Center (S310A220045)

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	21
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	20	20
<b>Quality of Project Personnel</b>		
1. Project Personnel	15	15
<b>Adequacy of Resources</b>		
1. Adequacy of Resources	20	15
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>71</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>80</b>

# Technical Review Form

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

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

Applicant: The Keystone Center (S310A220045)

## 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 project framework and activities are clearly articulated around nine goals, four levels of support, and three tiers (populations) to be served by the grant (e17-19). The applicant clearly articulates the content of the training activities for families (e60) and the training activities for educators (e66). The proposed training materials are of high quality. A detailed logic model is provided on e58, with clear milestones and timelines on e69-78.

Criterion A3: The applicant emphasizes that all materials will be freely available to all schools in Colorado during and after the period of the grant. The applicant further breaks out the numbers served and anticipated capacity on e80.

#### Weaknesses:

Criterion A2: The applicant does not provide citations or references to relevant research and practice. Several key personnel appear to have an extensive research background in family engagement (e129 as an example), but the applicant fails to embed the context of this prior research into the narrative about the project design. On e18, the applicant discusses published materials that the project design has been based on (the Family Engagement Opportunity Canvas and the Statewide Needs Inventory) without citations, making it difficult to ascertain the extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project reflect up-to-date research and effective practice.

Reader's Score: 21

### 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 has provided a clearly defined staffing chart on e79. The table on e69-78 provides milestones and timelines for deliverable elements.

Criterion B2: On e34, the applicant explains that the Assistant Project Director will be responsible for ensuring that all implementation partners are regularly tracking all project activities—what was done, who was served, and how well activities were implemented. These data will be part of a project database. The Assistant Project Director will meet with each individual implementation partner monthly to review progress toward milestones and create opportunities for two-way feedback.

Criterion B3: On e51, the applicant states the evaluation questions to help determine if the Colorado State Family Engagement Center projects are well-implemented and meeting the desired outcomes: “To what extent does the applicant and its partners successfully implement the planned activities outlined in this proposal?” “To what extent is CO-SFEC providing high-quality, relevant, and useful information and professional development to clients?” This feedback will be incorporated.

Criterion B4: The time commitments of key personnel, on e36 and e79, are appropriate and clearly articulated.

Criterion B5: The project is designed around culturally and linguistically diverse families (e26) and teacher cohort training (e66), with business persons on the project steering committee (e45-46).

**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 (e103) are appropriate to the project. The project director has developed workshops, institutes and statewide resiliency collaboratives in 3 states.

Criterion C2: The appropriate time commitments and qualifications of all key project personal (Project Director, Assistant Project Director, Program Coordinator) are provided on e38-42. Historically underrepresented groups are represented. The General Education Provisions Act statement on 83 details an emphasis on seeking applicants for employment who have been historically underrepresented.

Criterion C3: The narratives detailing the qualifications of each consultant are provided on e40 [Colorado Association for Bilingual Education (CO-CABE), Programming for Culturally and Linguistically Diverse (CLD) Families, Center for Rural School Health & Education (CRSHE), Supporting Colorado's Small Rural Schools and Districts, Johns Hopkins University) are provided on e40].

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses found.

**Reader's Score: 15**

**Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources**

**1. D. Adequacy of Resources (up to 20 points).**

**The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources for the proposed project. In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors--**

- (1) The relevance and demonstrated commitment of each partner in the proposed project to the implementation and success of the project.**
- (2) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project.**
- (3) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the number of persons to be served and the anticipated results and benefits.**

**Strengths:**

Criterion D2: The detailed budget on e146 clearly articulates and breaks out appropriate costs for training, resources, and support.

Criterion D3: The materials and trainings (e60) will be freely available and replicable throughout Colorado past the grant

period, so that there will be no continuing costs for the materials, for future use with participants. This is a positive anticipated benefit.

**Weaknesses:**

Criterion D1: The applicant proposes to implement the project at several schools. It is unclear if site partners have committed to the project.

Criterion D3: The Coaction Collective will receive \$250K-\$275K annually as an implementation partner (e147) in addition to another \$40K to the Coaction Collective annually for Staff Time (e148). The reason for this distinction is unclear, and when the number is broken down to the number of persons who will directly participate annually (e80), the cost per person is close to \$500, which is not reasonable in relation to the services to be provided.

**Reader's Score: 15**

**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: A needs assessment was conducted in Spring 2020 in response to Covid-19. The project design is the direct result of the needs assessment (e16).

CPP2c: The applicant proposal provides training and support for working with culturally and linguistically diverse families (e82).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses found.

**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: Two sets of four schools will be selected by feeder pattern (elementary, middle, and high schools that share families) annually (e25). The families selected will be culturally and linguistically diverse to promote equity and adequacy (e26-27).

CPP3b1: The applicant describes a year-long co-creation process (e82) and provides details on e25 that the year-long

building sessions will be a space for families to identify challenges related to resources and opportunities offered by the district, cross-department coordination, diversity plans within their building, or any other local need.

CPP3b2: The applicant provides information (e17) regarding the structure of the project around household, building, district, and state goals.

**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: On e22, the applicant states that the National Association of Family and community engagement will facilitate a cross-agency planning process through the regular convening of a cross-agency family engagement work group of the state agencies for education, human services, health, early childhood, child welfare, libraries, and others to identify shared family engagement objectives, align those objectives with individual agency initiatives and priorities, identify action steps for advancing family engagement, and develop a plan.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses found.

**Reader's Score: 3**

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 04/28/2022 01:05 PM



Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 04/28/2022 01:55 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: The Keystone Center (S310A220045)

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	24
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	20	20
<b>Quality of Project Personnel</b>		
1. Project Personnel	15	15
<b>Adequacy of Resources</b>		
1. Adequacy of Resources	20	18
<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: The Keystone Center (S310A220045)

## 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:

Under sub-criterion A(1), the underlying conceptual framework is well-demonstrated and includes vertical alignment across the state, district, school, and household levels (e18).

Under sub-criterion A(2), the proposed project reflects up-to-date effective practice including the National Parent Teacher Association (PTA) Standards and Dual Capacity Building Framework (e20) and innovative frameworks such as Liberatory Design (e25).

The application includes many systemic approaches to build capacity (e80) under sub-criterion A(3) such as a cohort model of professional learning designed to improve educator practice over the long term (e19) and a train-the-trainer model for districts (e22-23).

#### Weaknesses:

While the applicant references many current practice frameworks and resources in describing the design, the narrative does not include detailed discussion of the research base for these resources (e18) under sub-criterion A(2).

Reader's Score: 24

### Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

#### 1. B. Quality of the Management Plan (up to 20 points).

The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for

accomplishing project tasks.

- (2) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.
- (3) The adequacy of mechanisms for ensuring high-quality products and services from the proposed project.
- (4) The extent to which the time commitments of the project director and principal investigator and other key project personnel are appropriate and adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project.
- (5) How the applicant will ensure that a diversity of perspectives are brought to bear in the operation of the proposed project, including those of parents, teachers, the business community, a variety of disciplinary and professional fields, recipients or beneficiaries of services, or others, as appropriate.

**Strengths:**

Under sub-criterion B(1), the applicant clearly and completely describes a plan that includes teams and a cadence of meetings (e29-30) and a project timeline (e54) and summary table (e69) with milestones and defined responsibilities, along with a summary description of the cycle of school services (e66).

The application describes a quarterly schedule of meetings with the steering committee (e29-30) with guiding questions (e31) that will be used and a review procedure (e34-35) under sub-criterion B(2).

In order to ensure family-friendly and understandable resources for multilingual families, the project design includes consultation with experts in serving multilingual families (e40-41), and time from agency communications staff (e39).

Time commitments for the project director and key personnel are appropriate (e36, figure 8, e64) as required by sub-criterion B(4).

Per sub-criterion B(5), the advisory council includes membership with diverse perspectives and meets quarterly (e44).

**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 (e37, e103-104) under sub-criterion C(1).

Key project personnel and implementation partners are well-qualified (e105-128) under sub-criterion C(2), and the applicant includes a strong statement about recruiting and hiring individuals from underrepresented communities (e83) under criterion C.

Under sub-criterion C(3), consultants to the proposed project are well-qualified local and national experts (e40-44, figures 11 and 12).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses found.

**Reader's Score: 15**

**Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources**

**1. D. Adequacy of Resources (up to 20 points).**

**The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources for the proposed project. In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors--**

- (1) The relevance and demonstrated commitment of each partner in the proposed project to the implementation and success of the project.**
- (2) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project.**
- (3) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the number of persons to be served and the anticipated results and benefits.**

**Strengths:**

The application includes preliminary Memorandums of Understanding (MOUs) (e85-98) and letters of support (e99-102) which detail the relevance to the project and commitments from community-based organization partners as required by sub-criterion D(1). The applicant also details how districts will be recruited to participate (e19-20) over the life of the project.

The proposed project is ambitious (e68) and well-designed for impact under sub-criterion D(2) with a reasonable cost (e48-50). The applicant proposes to provide intense multi-year services to 40 schools in Colorado (e66-67), includes partner matching funds (e46, figure 13), and uses a virtual structure for professional learning (e19) to minimize travel costs.

Costs are reasonable under sub-criterion D(3) as outlined in the service explanation (e48) and table of persons served (e80) and budget narrative (e146).

**Weaknesses:**

Participating schools and districts are listed as contributing matching funds to the project (e46-47) by providing food and childcare for family events, however there is no evidence of commitment from any schools or districts under sub-criterion D(1).

Reader's Score: 18

## 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 which identified family engagement as one of four priorities for professional training (e16). Additionally, the state has completed an "opportunity canvas" to identify ways to align and improve statewide family engagement structures (e18, e21).

The applicant provides a detailed General Education Provisions Act (GEPA) statement on program accessibility (e7-8) to describe inclusivity of approaches required under CPP2(c) and plans to provide targeted direct services to multilingual families (e26-27).

#### 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 including professional training, school-based planning, and train-the-trainer (e22, e24, e25) as required by CPP3(a).

CPP3(b)(1) is a strength of the application with multiple strategies for improving the engagement of community members in decision-making including monthly coaching for district leaders (e23), use of the Liberatory Design model with schools (e25-26), and delivery of Civic Learning Labs (e28) for families.

**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 a cross-agency group (e22) to improve family engagement practices 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 01:55 PM