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

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Indiana Resource Center for Families with Special Needs, Inc (S310A220007)
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	18
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Project Personnel	15	13
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Adequacy of Resources	20	20
Sub Total	80	76
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	85

Technical Review Form

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

Applicant: Indiana Resource Center for Families with Special Needs, Inc (S310A220007)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. **A. Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 points).**

    The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors--

    (1) The extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework.

    (2) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project reflect up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice.

    (3) The extent to which the proposed project is designed to build capacity and yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance.

    Strengths:

    The applicant has incorporated up to date research in designing the proposed project. As a conceptual framework, the applicant has selected the Dual Capacity-Building Framework for Family-School Partnerships, which is a research-based model (e19, p1). In planning and executing family engagement activities, the applicant has incorporated the research undergirding the conceptual framework. Research from the authors of the framework suggests that successful family engagement activities and services take into account where parents are currently in terms of resources and capacity (e28, p10). Therefore, this project will partner with other service providers to provide resources such as transportation and childcare to facilitate parent engagement. The Dual Capacity-Building framework seems aptly suited for as a conceptual framework for this project.

    LEAs will also be expected to select and use research-based models to develop new routines, practices, and policies, and the University Consultant for this project, has published substantial related to the objectives on this topic (e25, p3).

    The project is positioned to build capacity and yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance. Starting with the spring of year one, monthly staff development opportunities will be provided at LEA sites, and each year in collaboration with the IDOE, the SFEC will sponsor two virtual one-day conferences for family and school personnel from partner LEAs (e21, p3). In addition, a video entailing the steps and progress being made at each LEA partner site will be produced quarterly and made available on the lead applicant's website. These videos will support capacity building being used for future trainings and as a resource for individuals (e21, p3).

    Monthly family empowerment activities, designed in alignment with strategic goals will also provide opportunities for family members to develop their leadership capacity and system impact by working with school leaders to develop policies and processes (e22, p4). These and other activities planned by the project will work in conjunction to continually provide opportunities to build capacity individually and systemically.

    Weaknesses:

    No weaknesses noted.

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

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

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

(2) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.

(3) The adequacy of mechanisms for ensuring high-quality products and services from the proposed project.

(4) The extent to which the time commitments of the project director and principal investigator and other key project personnel are appropriate and adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project.

(5) How the applicant will ensure that a diversity of perspectives are brought to bear in the operation of the proposed project, including those of parents, teachers, the business community, a variety of disciplinary and professional fields, recipients or beneficiaries of services, or others, as appropriate.

Strengths:

The applicant has included a detailed timeline of activities related to preparation, planning, capacity building, and implementation and sustainability (e40, p22). It includes clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones, to help ensure the project is completed on time and within budget. They have also included a broad timeline with yearly milestones. They will begin by surveying the mindset of school staff and requiring that at least 80% to believe increased family involvement has the potential to improve their circumstances. Next, they will identify the dynamics in each community and define what has been done to address family engagement. Once there is agreement on what should be addressed, each LEA will be given a standardized tool to evaluate family engagement (e36, p18). Using data collected, impact targets, outcomes for short-term results, and project activities will be identified.

To ensure ongoing feedback and continuous improvement, the project will gather and implement regular feedback. Each year, the project director and respective site committees will examine internally and externally influencing factors, adjusting those that could be improved and assessing feasibility of the upcoming activities and adjusting as necessary (e37, p19). The project director will serve as 1 FTE for the project, while the principal investigator will serve as .333. Both are sufficient to execute the assigned duties of the positions.

The applicant has put a variety of mechanisms in place to ensure a diversity of perspectives are manifested in operation of the proposed project. As an example, the project will include one LEA from five different regions in the state (N, S, E, W, C). Parent, youth, and school representatives from each LEAs will be brought together to form five Regional Stakeholder Groups (RSGs). Representatives from each RSG will serve on the statewide Advisory Committee (AC) that includes researchers, agencies, resource partners, businesses, and content experts (e20, p2). The RSG in each region will have representation from every underserved category in the communities served. This information will be gathered using the community's demographic data. Language and other accessibility barriers will be addressed by services already available within the LEA, currently provided by IN*SOURCE, or supplemented through the grant (e28, p10). RSG teams will be made up of parents, youth, school personnel, and representatives from local community agencies and businesses and will meet monthly to engage in activities such as facilitated needs assessment, strategic planning, asset mapping relevant to local services, training, and local leadership recommendations (e33, p15).

Weaknesses:

The applicant has provided limited information on how it will ensure high-quality products and services from the proposed project.

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:

   The applicant has selected personnel with relevant training and experience related to the grant. The principal investigator has successfully written and directed numerous competitive and formula grant awards over the last three decades; served as district administrator responsible for strategic school improvement plans; and a Deputy Superintendent for a district with both urban and rural challenges (e45, p27). Similarly, the university consultant brings a bevy of related experience. She currently serves as director of the Center on Community Living and Careers at the Indiana Institute on Disability and Community out of Indiana University and has over 25 years' experience as a special educator, direct service provider, advocate, training and technical assistance provider. Her research also includes a focus on the support of individuals and their families in accessing available resources and participating in their school and community (e46, p28). Other key personnel are also aptly suited for the project. For example, the external evaluator has experience with school and family partnerships (e46, p28), and the outreach coordinator has worked as an English-Spanish translator at IN*SOURCE for 25 years (e47, p29).

   Weaknesses:

   The applicant has included in the project, a director who is a woman of color with extensive experience working and living in communities with significant diversity and disadvantage, but has not provided an intentional plan for encouraging or ensuring applications from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented .

Reader's Score: 13

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

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

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

(1) The relevance and demonstrated commitment of each partner in the proposed project to the implementation and success of the project.

(2) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project.

(3) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the number of persons to be served and the anticipated results and benefits.

Strengths:

The applicant has presented preliminary MOUSs from the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE), the Institute of Education Leadership, a university consultant and the IEP Resource center. Each partner's commitment is strong and directly related to the needs of the project. For example, the IDOE has committed to providing data on family perspectives and student needs, support the development of resources and review research for policy development (e61), and the university consultant will collaborate with the principal investigator to disseminate project results via a white paper or other publication (e66).

In addition to providing a number of in-kind donations, such as an Assistant Director to ensure operational oversight and data management (e129), totaling $115, 373 (e50, p32), the applicant has presented costs that are reasonable in relation to the number of persons and objectives of the project. The applicant has also provided data to justify proposed salaries for new positions, such as the project director (e51, p33).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 20

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority 2 - Competitive Preference Priority 2

1. **Competitive Preference Priority 2-- Addressing the Impact of COVID-19 on Students, Educators, and Faculty (up to 3 points).**

   Projects that are designed to address the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic, including impacts that extend beyond the duration of the pandemic itself, on the students most impacted by the pandemic, with a focus on underserved students (as defined in the notice inviting applications, NIA) and the educators who serve them, through one or more of the following priority areas:

   (a) Conducting community asset-mapping and needs assessments that may include an assessment of the extent to which students, including subgroups of students, have become disengaged from learning, including students not participating in in-person or remote instruction, and specific strategies for reengaging and supporting students and their families.

   (b) Providing resources and supports to meet the basic, fundamental, health and safety needs of students and educators.

   (c) Addressing students' social, emotional, mental health, and academic need through approaches that are inclusive with regard to race, ethnicity, culture, language, and disability status.

Strengths:

The work of this project will focus on regions in the state with evidence of the most significant loss of learning and interruptions in instruction participation during the past two years (e26, p8). The applicant has provided a thorough plan for evaluating and addressing the impacts of COVID on families.

The Academic Impact report will assess student performance on state tests in reading grade 3, math and English grades 3-8, science grades 4 and 6, social studies grade 5. These data are available disaggregated by ethnicity, socioeconomic status, special education, English learners and gender, to allow the applicant to identify specific needs of specific subpopulations. Significant gaps were found among Indiana's racially and ethnically diverse, low-income, special education, and English language learner students (e26, p8), and domestic deaths have increased 85% from the year before COVID-19.

LEAs will be required to examine disproportion related to attendance patterns, suspected violence, educational neglect, and other issues. They will also be required to chart the health and safety needs of families and staff and take stock of resources in place to meet those needs. The LEA's Regional Coordinator will then use asset mapping to match needs to delivery systems, and each LEA will be required to share the intentional policies, processes, and strategies they are implementing to address needs (e27, p9). Outreach Coordinators will lead a formalized asset mapping process of collecting, evaluating, culling, organizing, cataloging, and plotting statewide and regional-specific assets to assure the availability of high-quality, relevant, and useful family engagement resources. This will result in an expansion of the IN*SOURCE website and a robust clearinghouse directory of easy-to-find resources and information for families and schools (e30, p12).

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:

This project will promote access to resources and opportunities for underserved students in early learning, elementary, middle, and high school settings. his work will also impact the high school students from each LEA who are participating in the programs at career and technical centers, alternative schools, and correctional facilities (e27, p9). LEAs will also be required to provide meaningful and accessible programming for family leadership opportunities and engagement at least once per month (e29, p10). The project will also include inter-district collaboration, as LEAs will be required to serve as model sites once polices and procedures are established. The applicant will also work to coordinate resources, such as transportation, for families to participate in engagement activities (e29, p11). IN*SOURCE, the lead agency for this project and Indiana's Parent Training and Information Center will work in coordination with LEAs to execute the project (e29, p11).

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 has clearly demonstrated a systemic approach to improving outcomes for underserved students in the priority area. In addition to assembling a partner consortium, comprised of various community partners, to provide resources for this project (e30, p12), IN*SOURCE, the lead applicant, is a member of the Indiana Resource Network, a consortium of agencies assembled and funded by the IDOE to provide services to schools (e29, p 11). IN*SOURCE also

includes an existing infrastructure of 30 liaisons and trainers on regional teams throughout Indiana, which will help support systemic change. Outreach Coordinators will also lead a formalized asset mapping process, collecting, evaluating, culling, organizing, cataloging, and plotting statewide and regional-specific assets to ensure availability of high-quality, relevant, and useful family engagement resources (e30, p12).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 3

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 05/05/2022 08:42 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Indiana Resource Center for Families with Special Needs, Inc (S310A220007)
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	18
Quality of Project Personnel			
1. Project Personnel		15	13
Adequacy of Resources			
1. Adequacy of Resources		20	18
	Sub Total	80	74
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	83

Technical Review Form

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

Applicant: Indiana Resource Center for Families with Special Needs, Inc (S310A220007)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. A. Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 points).

The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors--

(1) The extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework.

(2) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project reflect up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice.

(3) The extent to which the proposed project is designed to build capacity and yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance.

Strengths:

The logic model has clear and connected strategies and outcomes that are specific and aligned. There are clear goals for the short, medium, and long-term that consider sustainability (ex. LEAs will join national network, building capacity of parents and educators, expanding to more sites, etc.) (e20). The goals and strategies in the plan are based on the Dual Capacity-Building Framework (e21), and the applicant also identified several research frameworks to guide their work and assessments (e25). To build capacity and sustainability, the applicant outlines ways that they will monitor and work towards sustainability, primarily using year 5 to build up sustainability, including having the partner sites build up sustainability plans (e36). Page e39 outlines their sustainability plan for the long-term, including performance measures.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were found in this section.

Reader's Score: 25

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

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

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

(2) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.

(3) The adequacy of mechanisms for ensuring high-quality products and services from the proposed project.

(4) The extent to which the time commitments of the project director and principal investigator and other key project personnel are appropriate and adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project.

(5) How the applicant will ensure that a diversity of perspectives are brought to bear in the operation of the proposed project, including those of parents, teachers, the business community, a variety of disciplinary and professional fields, recipients or beneficiaries of services, or others, as appropriate.

Strengths:

For each goal in the plan, there is a named process for "quality control" and clear, measurable goals for evaluating progress, as well as details on the activities and process to achieve the goals (e21-22). The table on p. e55 deeply outlines the short, medium, and long-term indicators of impact, that are data-driven and aligned. The applicant has a preliminary MOU with IEL to contract the evaluation of the project (e34), and there are clear mechanisms for continuous improvement and feedback, including mid-year and annual reviews throughout the project (e57). The timelines and narrative about the indicators for each year explained what they would look for in changes each year, including a timeline for actions, which will ensure the quality of products and services (e37-41). The applicant will ensure that there will be parent, student, and other stakeholder group representation from LEAs from 5 different regions across the state. They also examine racial, socioeconomic, and other factors to ensure diversity of participation (e23).

Weaknesses:

The applicant only has one full time staff member, the Project Director. All other roles are 50 percent of less of time allocated. For example, the PI is only spending a third of her time with the SFEC. This does not seem adequate for the full scope of the project (126).

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:

The applicant outlines the qualifications and backgrounds of the personnel, as well as their roles and responsibilities related to the SFEC (e45 – 48). For example, the Project Investigator and ED for IN*SOURCE was previously a district administrator and worked for the department of education. She has overseen multiple state and federal grants and has

the network to ensure sustainable infrastructure for the SFEC in the long-term (e45). The project director, Sarita Stevens, is an education leadership doctoral candidate and has experience "working and living in communities with significant diversity and disadvantage," as well as the ability to build relationships with LEAs (e47). The appendices include resumes that outline all adequate qualifications and skills of the assigned staff for the project (e88-125).

Weaknesses:

There was minimal evidence in the application about intentional diversity of personnel and a focus on leadership from underrepresented groups.

Reader's Score: 13

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

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

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

    (1) The relevance and demonstrated commitment of each partner in the proposed project to the implementation and success of the project.

    (2) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project.

    (3) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the number of persons to be served and the anticipated results and benefits.

    Strengths:

    The application showed commitment from several IDOE department heads to lead this project., The IDOE committed to actively engage and support the SFEC (e31). The application included letters of commitment and MOUs from over a dozen partners across sectors and communities (e61 - 85). The applicant listed existing activities and programming for adult education for parents and families and, therefore, more than the required resources will go directly towards LEAs and agencies serving families and evidence-based parent education programs. The dollars will be used to increase sustainability (e50). The budget narrative in application adequately describes how the grantee would provide in-kind support, as well as direct funds for project needs (e50-53 and e126-131). The applicant anticipates that the reach of their services will double, due to becoming a SFEC (e49).

    Weaknesses:

    In the submitted budget, the applicant fails to include resources for participating families and the costs associated with their needs and time commitment for support the work of the SFEC (ex. Transportation, stipends, meals, childcare, etc.).

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:

The applicant used the 2021 Academic Impact Report to show inequities from pandemic (e18, 20). From this, they aim to prioritize support for communities with higher proportions of students and families not on grade level or disengaged. They use several data sources, including the KIDS COUNT data book, to further reinforce their focus on this student population (e27). The SFEC would require LEAs to "examine disproportion related to attendance patterns, suspected violence, educational neglect . . ." (e27), as well as will require LEAs to track COVID-19 cohorts using benchmarking data from 2021 report. Regional Stakeholder Groups (RSGs) would be made up of "at least 50% family members and students…from underserved populations present in school community" (e36). There is evidence of a community asset mapping that will take place within the first year of the grant to guide the SFEC priority areas (e14, 21, 27).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted in this section.

Reader's Score: 3

Competitive Preference Priority 3 - Competitive Preference Priority 3

1. **Competitive Preference Priority 3--Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources, and Opportunities (up to 3 points).**

   Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate that it proposes a project designed to promote educational equity and adequacy in resources and opportunity for underserved students--

   (a) In one or more of the following educational settings:

   (1) Early learning programs.

   (2) Elementary school.

   (3) Middle school.

   (4) High school.

   (5) Career and technical education programs.

   (6) Out-of-school-time settings.

(7) Alternative schools and programs.

(8) Juvenile justice system or correctional facilities; and

(9) Adult learning.

(b) That is designed to examine the sources of inequities related to, and implement responses through, one or more of the following:

(1) Establishing, expanding, or improving the engagement of underserved community members (including underserved students and families) in informing and making decisions that influence policy and practice at the school, district, or State level by elevating their voices and their perspectives and providing them with access to opportunities for leadership (e.g., establishing student government programs and parent and caregiver leadership initiatives)).

(2) Increasing student racial or socioeconomic diversity, through developing or implementing evidence-based policies or strategies that include one or more of the following:

(i) Ongoing, robust family and community involvement.

(ii) Intra- or inter-district or regional coordination.

(iii) Cross-agency collaboration, such as with housing or transportation authorities.

(iv) Alignment with an existing public diversity plan or diversity needs assessment.

Strengths:

This application targets early learning, elementary, and secondary students in underserved communities (e14), and provides a sample table of LEAs that have expressed interest and shared the impact according to poverty, special needs, English learners, and race (e23). The applicant also gave several examples of how they would consider the backgrounds of families and students when creating the leadership teams at each site (e28). They also named students in CTE programs and correctional facilitates as priorities (e27). The logic model in the application specifically names and targets students and families "from marginalized cultures," as well as connects its strategies and outcomes to higher academic achievement (e20). Several entities outlined in the application would prioritize families and communities of color for leadership and input, such as the advisory committee and the regional stakeholder groups (e33 – 34). Additionally, parent leadership development is built into the project activities, like parent leader trainings starting in year two (e37).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted in this section.

Reader's Score: 3

Competitive Preference Priority 4 - Competitive Preference Priority 4

1. Competitive Preference Priority 4--Strengthening Cross-Agency Coordination and Community Engagement to Advance Systemic Change (up to 3 points).

Projects that are designed to take a systemic approach to improving outcomes for underserved students in the following priority area:

(a) Establishing cross-agency partnerships, or community-based partnerships with local nonprofit organizations, businesses, philanthropic organizations, or others, to meet family well-being needs.

Strengths:

The applicant is a member of an existing consortium of agencies across the state and has existing infrastructure and connections to partners in multiple sectors and that represent diverse communities (e29-31). The applicant plans on creating a "Partner Consortium" as part of the asset-mapping process (e30), as well as ensuring there is representation from across the state.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were found in this section.

Reader's Score: 3

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 05/05/2022 03:24 PM