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

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: The Ohio State University (S310A220014)
Reader #1: **********

		Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions			
Selection Criteria			
Quality of Project Design			
1. Quality of Project Design		25	21
Quality of the Management Plan			
1. Management Plan		20	17
Quality of Project Personnel			
1. Project Personnel		15	15
Adequacy of Resources			
1. Adequacy of Resources		20	18
	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	2
	Sub Total	3	2
	Total	89	79

Technical Review Form

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

Applicant: The Ohio State University (S310A220014)

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 applicant provides rationale for the proposed project through extensively cited statistics regarding absenteeism and graduation rates for ELs. On e19, it is noted that absenteeism has increased from 11% in the 19-20 school year to 32% in the 20-21 school year. The logic model and framework narrative provided (e18-e28) details the specific activities and number of participants.

    Criterion A2: The applicant demonstrates both familiarity with and participation in relevant research related to text messaging as an engagement strategy as well as relational, asset-based, culturally-responsive and respectful family engagement strategies (e29).

    Weaknesses:

    Criterion A3: The applicant projects (e18) that the training will be provided onsite by Counselors in a Train the Trainers capacity for 'over 10,000 educators and other professionals,' without providing documented assurances from the LEAs and schools of these educators that the anticipated training of other educators by the counselors that participate in this program will occur. This important capacity projection is not clearly documented.

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 responsibilities and timelines, and milestones for nearly all principal contractors is clear. Some questions about analysis and reporting are addressed in Section E.

Criterion B4: The applicant provides assurance that the time commitments for key and support personnel as currently determined (Table 4, e40) are appropriate and adequate for the proposed project.

Criterion B5: The applicant presents convincing evidence that the project will recruit families and caregivers that will reflect the membership of the Statewide Advisory Council. The Statewide Advisory Council (SAC) is currently 50% Black, Indigenous, Persons of Color (BIPOC), and additionally provides assistance and resources under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) for members (e40).

Weaknesses:

Criterion B2: It is difficult to gauge the adequacy of feedback and continuous improvement related to the operation of the proposed project. On e38, a reference to "monthly" meetings with the evaluator is made. The narrative does not provide further explanation.

Criterion B3: The applicant does not include a sufficiently detailed explanation of how the created materials will go through the design process with the incorporation of feedback from parents and educators. Feedback from both are said to be incorporated at all five stated stages of the design process (e39), without explanation of how the voices are determined or how they have access to the materials for evaluation several times through the process.

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:

Criterion C1: The applicant provides convincing evidence of the qualifications of the principal investigator in the form of summary (e40) and CV (e73), and states a commitment to underrepresented groups, minorities, and women in the building of a diverse staff (e40).

Criterion C2: The qualifications of key project personnel are appropriate. It is also commendable that the applicant has included partnership with qualified, profession translation services (e147).

Criterion C3: The applicant provides convincing evidence of the qualifications of the consultants and subcontractors (e83-e107).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were 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 D1: The applicant includes letters of cooperation (see examples on e112, 115, 125, 127) and MOUs from several partners. The applicant provides the salaries and time allotment for personnel and contractors.

   Criterion D2: The project proposes to encourage and empower parents and caregivers to take a central role in providing feedback at the local level, and the costs are reasonable.

   Criterion D3: The itemized budget and narrative of line items over the life of the grant both demonstrate that the included

costs are reasonable in relation to the number of persons to be served and the anticipated benefits.

Weaknesses:

Criterion D1: The applicant does not include letters of cooperation from all LEAs to be served by the grant.

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:

   Criterion CPP2a: The applicant will conduct a needs assessment survey to inform the tailoring of strategies to address chronic absenteeism in the English Learner population caused by the pandemic (e32).

   Criterion CPP2b: Ohio Leadership, Equity, Advocacy, Development, and Support (Ohio LEADS) will address mental health, health and safety support, racism, and other topics in schools that affect educators and students through training materials and collaboration with partners (e33).

   Criterion CPP2c: The applicant has a demonstrated history of inclusivity in family engagement (e33) and will expand collaborations with community organizations such as Community Refugee Engagement Services (e115).

   Weaknesses:

   No weaknesses were 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:

   Criterion CPP3a: The applicant will prioritize supporting local education agencies (LEAs) K-12 that serve high concentrations of disadvantaged students (e33-34).

   Criterion CPP3b1: Parents and caregivers are supported and guided on how to join and participate in Family Leaders for Schools Academies, to then serve on School Action Teams (e30).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were 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:

   Criterion CPP4: The applicant effectively demonstrates that community partnerships will be established to meet the needs of immigrants, refugees, and their families (e35, e115). Furthermore, the training model will effect cross-agency partnership and collaboration between LEAs, and SEAs.

   Weaknesses:

   It is unclear the process by which the community partnerships will take a "systemic" approach to improving outcomes for underserved students.

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 04/22/2022 02:53 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: The Ohio State University (S310A220014)
Reader #2:   **********

		Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions			
Selection Criteria			
Quality of Project Design			
1. Quality of Project Design		25	23
Quality of the Management Plan			
1. Management Plan		20	19
Quality of Project Personnel			
1. Project Personnel		15	15
Adequacy of Resources			
1. Adequacy of Resources		20	17
	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	1
	Sub Total	3	1
	Total	89	81

Technical Review Form

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

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

Applicant: The Ohio State University (S310A220014)

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 application demonstrates clear application of the dual capacity framework by including programs for families and for educators and schools (e29) under sub-criterion A(1). There is also structured support for implementation of the NNPS model (e25) and strategies are aligned to reduce chronic absenteeism across planned activities.

   Under sub-criterion A(2), the model programs chosen are well-known in the field, for example NNPS (e25), the Prichard Committee for parent leadership (e21), and a text-based intervention for sharing information with families (e20).

   The application provides detailed discussion of capacity building for family engagement activities to meet sub-criterion A (3) including a statewide infrastructure (e26-27), sustainability plan (e31), and ongoing support for school-based teams that are aligned with school improvement requirements statewide.

   Weaknesses:

   The application materials are not specific as to the State Department of Education's or partnering districts' interest or willingness to participate in Activity 4: Student and Educator Mental Health (SEMH) program, despite substantial schoolwide requirements like student surveys and tier one interventions proposed (e29). Under sub-criterion A(3), this buy-in is important for building capacity yielding results beyond the grant period in the proposed area of student and educator mental health.

Reader's Score: 23

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:

Sub-criterion B(1) is demonstrated by a clear project timeline by year (e36-37), and narrative rollout discussion (e43-45).

The proposed project includes feedback structures required by sub-criterion B(2) including a pilot and revision plan for the family leadership program (e21).

The applicant describes multiple ways to ensure high-quality products and services under sub-criterion B(3) including new partnerships to meet the needs of families of EL students (e33) and a practice of advisory council review of all materials (e38).

Sub-criterion B(4) is thoroughly discussed by year of implementation (e136-167).

In addition to a statewide advisory council, the applicant's General Education Provisions Act (GEPA) statement (e7) includes specific strategies to include multiple perspectives in proposed activities under sub-criterion B(5).

Weaknesses:

The applicant describes use of feedback for continuous improvement under sub-criterion B(2), but is vague in the discussion of procedures, frequency, and timelines for the review of this feedback to inform project activities.

Reader's Score: 19

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:

Sub-criterion C(1) is demonstrated by the summary (e40-41), including a discussion of how the applicant will approach hiring key staff to work with families of EL students under sub-criterion C(2). Partners and subcontractors' experience (appendix) is adequately demonstrated under sub-criterion C(3).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses identified.

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:

There is evidence of partnership commitments, including matching funds from the Ohio Department of Education (e131) under sub-criterion D(1).

To meet sub-criterion D(2), there is an extensive budget narrative, including a budget for interpreting services and document translation (e130) aligned with the proposed project design.

Detailed discussion of the budget (e136-174) demonstrates sub-criterion D(3).

Weaknesses:

Under D(1) district partnerships (e112-114) are vague in commitment to the specific services proposed under the project, as are the commitments from the Department of Education (e120-121) and the regional State Support Teams (e127-129), and there is limited explanation of how districts and schools will be recruited to participate.

Reader's Score: 17

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 plans a targeted needs assessment under CPP2(a) with EL families focused on chronic absenteeism (e20) as indicated by current data. Also, under CPP2(a), specific resources will be developed from the needs assessment and delivered to families via text message.

   Under CPP2(c), the applicant proposes a targeted student and educator mental health program, with a focus on 20 middle schools. The proposal articulates well a connection between mental health and chronic absence, and plans to include families in school-based interventions (e24).

   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 applicant proposes to serve students, families, and educators from PK – 12 under CPP3(a).

The applicant proposes a parent/family leadership program that includes web-based resources and project-based learning for 120 families (e22) to meet CPP3(b)(1). Additionally, the proposed programs include targeted resources for families of English Learner (EL) students (e18), and targeted resources and programming at libraries (e23) under CPP3(b)(2)(i).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses identified.

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 statewide family resource program will include resources for families (e19-20) including financial literacy and school-based teams under the National Network of Partnership Schools (NNPS) model may include family well-being needs in their plans.

Weaknesses:

The application includes sparse evidence of systemic approaches to meeting family well-being needs under CPP4(a).

Reader's Score: 1

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 04/25/2022 11:50 AM