

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 05/06/2022 09:04 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: National Center for Families Learning (S310A220043)

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	16
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Project Personnel	15	15
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Adequacy of Resources	20	15
Sub Total	80	71
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	80

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - SFEC Tier 1 Panel - 2: 84.310A

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: National Center for Families Learning (S310A220043)

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 elected to use the Dual Capacity-Building Framework for Family-School Partnerships (e24, p4) and provided a comprehensive logic model (e26) to support the project's conceptual framework and design. The National Center for Families Learning (NCFL) Family literacy program is evidence-based. Findings from a 2018 study of the program showed an increased frequency of at-home reading to or with children for parents who were full participants; statistically significant improvements in child school attendance, parental level of participation in a student's school attendance, academic mindset, and reading achievement; and a meaningful effect for increased adult participation on education-related parenting behaviors, and students' reading levels (Levesque, J. & Scordias, M., 2018) (e41, p21). Similarly, the use of the project's home visitation model is also supported by research. A 2019 study found that children who participated in a home visitation program performed significantly better over time on English, reading, and math assessments, while their parents demonstrated improved parenting quality (e41, p21). The proposed project is structured in such a way to build the capacity of parents, schools, and communities through training and technical assistance, provided at regional training hubs (e33, p14) and high-impact family engagement activities (e28, p8). Consortium partners will provide cradle-to-career family engagement activities through a train-the-trainer approach. (e33, p14). The project is also designed, so that leadership and project oversight are gradually released to state-based management by the end of the grant. . The applicant serves primarily in a support role in Years 4 and 5 (e27, p7). Throughout the project, digital video interviews of best practices and lessons learned on family engagement will be uploaded and shared with pre-service teachers, in-service educators, administrators, families, and community partners through a digital repository (e31, p11). The site will be updated with materials and resources that reflect new findings and responsiveness to target populations (e33, p12). These processes will provide participants with the information needed to support family engagement and are designed to outlast the project.

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:

Each spring, the evaluator will conduct individual interviews with project staff, SEA staff, and Advisory Committee members to gather their perspectives on implementation, project success, challenges and lessons learned, and the effectiveness of the Advisory Committee. Focus groups will also be conducted each spring with a purposive sample of school staff implementing high-impact programming. Focus groups will be semi-structured and probe for perceptions of improved competencies related to the program (e66, p46).

To ensure the provision of high-quality products and services, the applicant has selected project practices grounded in research; and will provide project staff with ongoing professional learning to ensure they are performing at a high level in carrying out the proposed activities and strategies. The project team will also consistently increase their knowledge of current research and discuss the implementation of related skills and practices with colleagues to find what methods work best in their roles and settings as research continues to evolve (e53, p33).

The time commitment of the project director seems adequate and appropriate at .25 FTE (e54, p34).

The applicant's advisory committee will ensure a diversity of perspectives are included in the program's operation. The advisory committee will consist of parents, representatives demonstrating expertise in improving services for disadvantaged children, local schools, LEAs, the SEA, and diverse state agencies, systems, and organizations that support family success and well-being (e31, p11). The project will also include regional hubs that are urban, suburban and rural to further ensure diverse perspectives (e33, p13).

Weaknesses:

The applicant has provided broad comprehensive management plan that includes high-level timelines and activities and responsible organizations. Still, it does not include clearly defined responsibilities (e49, p29). Without identifying specific individuals responsible for carrying out each task, it is difficult to ensure all tasks will be completed on time and within budget. Leaving tasks only to organizations promotes the diffusion of responsibility, which could ultimately result in no one being directly responsible for and completing the task.

The applicant has provided a plan to collect intentional feedback from project staff and participants (e66, p46). Still, it is not clear from the information provided how the information will be used to foster continuous improvement. It is also not clear from the information provided how much time will be committed to the project by the principal investigator. Although the applicant identifies the training and experience of the principal investigator (e57, p37), the PI's time commitment is not outlined in the narrative or budget.

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:

The applicant's project director has more than two decades' experience supporting teaching and learning, family engagement in education, and innovation and equity in P-20 education and has worked closely with various SEAs and LEAs to implement and scale major reform efforts (e56, p36). The project director has also worked as a superintendent and has degrees in elementary education and instruction and administration (e100).

Key personnel are equally well-trained and experienced. The principal investigator serves as a partner on the Policy and Evaluation team at Bellwether Education Partners, where her work has focused on program evaluation, evaluation capacity-building, teacher preparation and training, and whole child development. She has also worked as a trainer and evaluator for a social and ethical awareness program in Boston Public Schools. She holds a bachelor's degree and a master's in elementary education, and a doctorate in education in human development and psychology (e57, p37).

Project consultants, such as Bellwether and Dr. Yeh from UNC Greensboro, also bring relevant experience to the project. Bellwether works with an array of organizations, including districts, states, charters, foundations, nonprofits, associations, and mission-driven for-profit organizations across the nation to conduct evaluations, while the work of Dr. Yeh focuses on the promotion of strength-based, community-engaged, culturally responsive practices in education (e58, p38).

The applicant has also intentionally committed to hiring staff representing diversity across cultural, ethnic, racial, and professional experience backgrounds by employing a research-based Recruiting for Diversity strategy developed with a certified Diversity, Equity, & Inclusion strategist and consultant (e43, p34).

Weaknesses:

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:

The applicant has demonstrated strong and relevant commitments from its partners through letters of support (e73) and a preliminary memorandum of understanding from Public Schools of North Carolina (e78).

Weaknesses:

The provided budget contains high-level information on program costs. For example, while total costs for personnel were included, it is not clear how much each staff member would be paid (e117). Or, for professional learning, only a total cost of \$5000 was provided, without details as to what would be included in the proffered costs (e122). Without relevant details, it is difficult to fully ascertain whether proposed costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives or number of persons served.

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:

The applicant will address the impacts of the COVID 19 pandemic throughout the project. In Year 1 of the project, the applicant will conduct a statewide community asset map. During this phase (October 2022-March 2023), listening sessions will be hosted to explore the interests and community needs of the eight North Carolina educational regions . The Asset Inventory will be distributed to administrators, educators, community leaders, and families from diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds (e30, p10).

Asset mapping will also inform the co-design of the project, and initiate dialogues among key stakeholders to enhance state-wide coordination and collaborations to promote equity in family education and student learning (e31, p11).

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 proposed project is designed to support families from cradle to career (e24, p4) and examine educator and family needs and potential for collaborations to promote equity (e30, p10). Outcomes from asset mapping will inform the co-design of the project and initiate dialogues among key stakeholders to enhance state-wide coordination and collaborations to promote equity in family engagement and student learning (e31, p11).

Parent voice will also be amplified through the project design. Participants will be invited to join a planning committee to lead family engagement research, policy, and practice dialogues with representatives from the SEA, LEAs within the region, community agencies, educators, and families. Regional educators and family liaisons will work with local educators and family leaders to lead the dialogue (e34, 14).

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 proposed project intersects with the work of the state department of education and several other community-based organizations (e44, p24). For example, not only does the project build upon the SEAs initiative to address student needs resulting from COVID, Every Child NC (ECNC), another partner, is a community-led, statewide coalition of organizations, parents, teachers, and students who advocate for every child's constitutional right to a sound, basic education, and Book Harvest will provide resources to support family engagement (e73).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 3

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 05/06/2022 09:04 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 05/05/2022 02:24 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: National Center for Families Learning (S310A220043)

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	17
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Project Personnel	15	14
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

Panel #2 - SFEC Tier 1 Panel - 2: 84.310A

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: National Center for Families Learning (S310A220043)

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 NC SFEC is modeled on successful SFECs across the nation, built around the Dual Capacity-Building Framework, which undergirds their logic model and theory of change (e24). The applicant shows how they will ensure the systems (systemic, integrated, and sustained) and programmatic (capacity-building, linked to learning, etc.) elements of the SFEC align to the DCBF (e25-27). The research and practice underlying the project include participatory research principles for the asset-mapping (e30), home visiting (e36), evidence-based literacy programs (e36), and co-creation in education (e42). The logic model provided shows a clear connection between the activities, objectives, outcomes, and performance metrics, which indicates a strong alignment and ability to accomplish the results. There is a plan for long-term sustainability, including building a framework and process for gradual release for the state to manage (e26-27).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted 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:

The application includes a clear allocation of activities aligned to the program objectives, as well as the partners who will be responsible for activities and the years of implementation (e49-51). The applicant mentions various modes for collecting feedback and collaboration, especially to gather feedback from families and community members (e33-35). They provide a table that outlines the scope and sequence for feedback and continuous improvement that includes the frequency of feedback (e51-52). The applicant has previously led and supported several other SFECs, giving them a strong foundation for high-quality products and services that build upon the learnings of other SFECs (e48). Additionally, the SFEC staff will regularly engage in staff professional learning to ensure successful strategies and results (e53). The Project Director (25%) is based in Kentucky, but the applicant plans on hiring a State Director (100%) and two Family Learning Specialists (100%) (e53-55, e106-108). In addition to forming an advisory committee, the applicant will also integrate practices such as affinity focus groups, an asset inventory, and storytelling interviews (e30-31). The advisory committee itself will have representation from schools, LEAs, state agencies, and other community organizations (e31).

Weaknesses:

The project outcomes and activities were clearly aligned, but there needed to be a more concrete timeline with more of a scope and sequence for when activities will happen within the year, as well as milestones for measuring progress and concrete due dates (e49-51).

Reader's Score: 17

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 resumes and descriptions of roles (e80-108) in the application adequately describe the responsibilities of the roles, as well as the training and experiences the staff have related to the project. The applicant plans to hire open roles as soon as the grant is awarded (e54-56). The applicant has a strategy in place for recruiting diverse individuals for open positions and previously hired a consultant to assist in creating a process for this (e54).

Weaknesses:

Though there are clear lines of responsibilities and qualifications described for each of the roles, it's not clear how the applicant will fill the open roles. Specifically, the Project Director position, with 100% of its time allocated to the project, is unfilled potentially leaving a large leadership gap. The applicant failed to provide some type of plan for hiring, as well as the qualifications and experience required for that role, such as a job description.

Reader's Score: 14

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:

Sufficient letters of support, including from the NC Department of Education, an LEA, and relevant community partners, were included in the application. These letters also included clear responsibilities and commitments from the partners towards the project (e73-78). The budget aligns clearly with the activities, goals, and staffing requirements for the SFEC. Specifically, the budget allocations decrease over time as the project plans to phase out and pass responsibility over to the NC Department of Education for long-term oversight and support (e117-124). The applicant also notes where they will provide support for families (translation, childcare, etc.), as well as compensation (stipends, etc.) to ensure their participation in the project (e122). The SFEC plans on serving 35,000 parents, practitioners, school leaders, educators, parent facilitators, and agency representatives via its technical assistance; 1,320 parents and children via direct programming; and three proposed program sites (e14, 40).

Weaknesses:

The budget narrative in the application breaks down the yearly percentages of time allocated for the project but does not denote the salaries projected for the roles. This makes it difficult to determine whether the salaries are adequate and, therefore, appropriate compared to the level of work and responsibilities, as well as how they will contribute to the project significance and objectives (e177-124).

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 will conduct asset-mapping to both understand the needs and strengths of the communities, as well as "illuminate current assumptions, beliefs, and worldviews among families, schools, and community stakeholders that will be incorporated into TTA and high-impact FE programming" (e28-30, e42). Additionally, the underlying goal for the project, according to the theory of change, is to integrate "lessons learned addressing the impact from the COVID-19 pandemic," and, therefore, "enhance recovery efforts" (e25).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted in this section.

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 intends to impact students from birth to adulthood in a wide range of educational settings, as demonstrated several times in the application. For example, the SFEC will provide training around the state via regional hubs that will offer cradle-to-career trainings (e29, e33). Additionally, there are multiple activities designed to support the leadership development of families (advisory committee, parent leadership, cross-regional trainings, etc.) through the project (e29, 32, 34). In particular, the applicant plans to implement Parent Leadership Programs at three LEAs to build parents' leadership skills and capacity (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 SFEC will establish a consortium, led by NCFL and including organizations like Book Harvest, NC Parents as Teachers, UNC Greensboro, the NC SEA, and LEAs in communities with the most need (e21, e44).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted in this section.

Reader's Score: 3

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 05/05/2022 02:24 PM