

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/20/2018 01:43 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: The Prichard Committee for Academic Excellence (U310A180004)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	30
Quality of Management Plan/Project Personnel		
1. Management/Personel	20	16
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Resources	20	20
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	30	0
Sub Total	100	66
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
Competitive Preference Priority 1a or 1b		
1. CPP 1(a) or CPP 1(b)	3	0
Sub Total	3	0
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
1. CPP 2	3	3
Sub Total	3	3
Total	106	69

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - SFEC - 1: 84.310A

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: The Prichard Committee for Academic Excellence (U310A180004)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. 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—

- (1) The extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework.
- (2) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project reflect up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice.
- (3) The extent to which the proposed project is designed to build capacity and yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance.

Strengths:

1.The applicant provides extensive narrative indicating KY SFEC proposes a comprehensive family and school partnership framework that creates systemic and sustainable conditions to build the capacity of parents, schools and community organizations. The applicant indicates the framework of the program is applicable cradle-to-career and will support student achievement, inform families about educational options and support school improvement. KY SFEC will implement Dual Capacity-Building Framework for Family School Partnerships, e22, which will ensure they create the conditions necessary to develop effective family engagement initiatives that will improve schools and student achievement, cradle-to- career. The Framework was constructed from research indicating that school and home partnerships flourish when the family and educators both have the knowledge, skills and abilities to interact in a positive, productive and intentional way. e36.

2.The applicant provides narrative indicating extensive research and parental involvement in the most effective up-to-date practices to implement the program. For example, following an exhaustive research and literature review with input of students, parents, educators, partners, and policy-makers, they developed a research-informed, proactive response to the state's cradle-to-career educational pipeline. The research-based Dual Capacity-Building Framework for Family School Partnerships is the foundation of the chosen work, and research and effective practices inform the services and activities. Mapp has consistently found that academic achievement increases if parents are involved and engaged in a child's learning. For example, the applicant indicates parent engagement strategies are embedded in operational structure and processes such as teacher recruitment, professional development, evaluation and assessment. Adequate resources, supports, and commitments to maintain and extend effects beyond grant are put into place e37, e39

3.The applicant provides evidence it will yield results that extend beyond federal funding. For example, the work with parents will build parent capacity to serve in leadership roles, engage with schools, and become decision makers at the local, state and national levels. Parents will be provided the information, tools and opportunities to become parent leaders and encouraged to develop leadership in their fellow parents. As parents develop an understanding of the intersections among policy, environment, and learning, the awareness and increased competencies will lead them to engage in processes that will drive change. e41

Weaknesses:

- 1 No weaknesses noted.

2. No weaknesses noted
3. No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 30

Selection Criteria - Quality of Management Plan/Project Personnel

- 1. The Secretary considers the quality of the services to be provided by 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—**
 - (1) 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.**
 - (2) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project involve the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project services.**
 - (3) 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.**
 - (4) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel.**

Strengths:

1.The applicant provides details on the plan to get input and participation from all segments of the target population. To ensure a diversity of perspectives are brought to bear in the operation of the proposed project, the Prichard Committee will establish an Advisory Committee for KY SFEC to inform project planning, implementation, evaluation and continuous improvement. The majority of the Advisory Committee will be comprised of parents. Membership will include representatives of the education, business and non-profit sectors including, but not limited to: students and parents of diverse backgrounds and abilities; early childhood care professionals; teachers; community organizations that serve African American, Latino, and refugee students and families and non- English-speaking populations. e36.

2.The applicant provides narrative indicating The Prichard Committee will serve as the lead organization and fiscal agent for KY SFEC. In addition to providing statewide leadership and grant management, the Prichard Committee will provide statewide parent leadership training for parents and families through the Commonwealth Institute for Parent Leadership; provide statewide opportunities for training and technical assistance to KDE, LEAs, schools, and community-based organizations through an annual conference and convene a statewide Advisory Committee to guide all project efforts. The applicant indicates it will provide a continuum of services that target family engagement services to high-need populations and identify best practices and programs that support traditionally underserved communities, the Prichard Committee will partner with three organizations to establish Regional Family Engagement Centers. Regional Centers will serve differing geographic regions to target services to specific high-need populations. A list of all organizations committed to the program is provided. e46, e47.

3.The applicant provides substantial narrative indicating based on previous project management experiences and in conjunction with community-based organizations and partners assuring ample experience with the target population. The program has established policies and procedures in place for collecting data, managing finances and tracking services. The systems for managing personnel, budgets, and project performance are compliant with the Uniform Administrative Guidelines, cost principles and the education department guidelines. The applicant includes a chart with Year 1 timeline with milestones for accomplishing project tasks and the party responsible for each task. e49, e50.

4. The qualifications for the Project Director appear to be excellent in formal training and work experience in fields related to the objectives of the project and experience in designing, managing, or implementing similar projects to provide the needed leadership. The required field experience and administration capabilities are excellent. Qualifications and experience for other key staff meet the required standards for the project. Experience and educational background are described. The requirements are enough to meet the needs of the project. The proposal seeks to employ persons who have succeeded in overcoming barriers like those confronting the target population. The applicant provides an excellent description of steps it will take to meet the goal of bringing on board experienced and talented staff. For example, The Prichard Committee has engaged a range of partners and parents in the planning, design and development of this proposal to ensure that the KY SFEC project will support high- impact cradle-to-career family, school and community engagement statewide. The partners, have a direct role in the delivery of grant services and/or the integration of project outcomes into policy or systemic structures to ensure sustainability. The role of key staff and stakeholders are clearly identified. For example, Principal Investigator (20% FTE): Executive Director of the Prichard Committee for Academic Excellence, will serve as the principal investigator and will devote 20% of the time to this role. e50, e51, e52, e53, e54

Weaknesses:

1. The applicant does not indicate or identify how the program will include person with disabilities in the services of the program. No indication is provided if persons with disabilities will be included in the advisory council
2. No weaknesses noted.
3. The applicant does not provide a schedule of activities for years 2,3, 4 and 5.

Reader's Score: 16

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

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

Strengths:

1. The applicant provides evidence of commitment of partners of the program including Memoranda of Understandings. For example, the applicant indicates the Core Partners, on an included list, have a direct role in the delivery of grant services and/or the integration of project outcomes into policy or systemic structures to ensure sustainability. Each Core Partner has signed a preliminary MOU that outlines their commitment to the project roles and responsibilities outlined in this proposal; those receiving grant funding to deliver services and/or training have also outlined their financial commitment to provide 15% match in project years 2 through 5. Within the first year of the project, the program will develop and submit a final MOU. e54 through e58.

2.The applicant provides a very detailed Budget Narrative and details on all monies involved with the program. The budget is detailed and well organized. From the information provided it appears to be adequate to support planned services and activities. Expenditures and personnel responsible for the budget are clearly identified. For example, the applicant indicates funds will be used to increase parent participation in decision making and for parents to serve in educational leadership roles. "The cost per student is less than \$1.52 per year and is reasonable given the changes that will occur in entrenched social and behavioral norms held in our state and given the long-term, sustainable results and benefits that will be derived from the program." e58, e59, e60, Budget e61.

3.The applicant provides a very detail narrative on the target population to be impacted. The project will build the capacity of families and schools to join forces and work collaboratively to help students succeed. The costs of the program are reasonable given the potential for this project to shift the prevailing behaviors of school and family relationships and support parents in being an educational advocate for their children. The policy development and advocacy activities will have wide-ranging impact on 656,588 students in the state, and their schools and families. In addition, the project will build the knowledge base of teachers, school administrators, community-based organizations, and families. Once the skills of the families and schools are strengthened and their competencies and abilities are developed, the learning gained during the project will continue to positively impact the 225,907 children in the target area and their communities, schools and families for years to come. Costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, scope of the project and number of persons impacted. e60, e61.

Weaknesses:

1. No weaknesses noted.
2. No weaknesses noted.
3. No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers:
 - (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible.
 - (2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.
 - (3) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce promising evidence (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)) about the project's effectiveness.

Strengths:

Does not apply.

Weaknesses:

Does not apply

Reader's Score: 0

Priority Questions**Competitive Preference Priority 1 - Competitive Preference Priority 1a or 1b****1. The Secretary gives priority to projects that are designed to--**

(a) Create SFECs that will provide direct services to parents and families through evidence-based (as defined in the notice inviting applications, NIA) activities.

(b) Provide families with evidence-based (as defined in the NIA) strategies for promoting literacy. This may include providing families with access to books or other physical or digital materials or content about how to support their child's reading development, or providing family literacy activities (as defined in section 203(9) of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act).

Note: An application will not receive points for both (a) and (b) under Competitive Preference Priority 1.

Strengths:

Does not apply.

Weaknesses:

Does not apply.

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority 2 - Competitive Preference Priority 2**1. The Secretary gives priority to projects that are designed to provide families with the information and tools they need to make important decisions regarding the educational choice (as defined in the NIA) that is most appropriate for their children.****Strengths:**

The applicant provides narrative clearly showing it addresses Competitive Preference Priority 2. The Kentucky Statewide Family Engagement Center is structured to support families of children cradle-to-career and to ensure that families have the information and tools they need to make important decisions regarding educational choices. For example, a key component of the KY SFEC's work will be to develop and disseminate tools and information on educational choice. In line with the dual capacity-building framework, materials will be developed specifically for parents, educators and community-based organizations. In addition to providing information and tools to support parent decision making regarding educational choice, they will provide opportunities for parents and educators to collaboratively discuss options. e26, e27.

Weaknesses:

2. No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 3

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/20/2018 01:43 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/20/2018 01:58 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: The Prichard Committee for Academic Excellence (U310A180004)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	0
Quality of Management Plan/Project Personnel		
1. Management/Personel	20	0
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Resources	20	0
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	30	27
Sub Total	100	27
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
Competitive Preference Priority 1a or 1b		
1. CPP 1(a) or CPP 1(b)	3	0
Sub Total	3	0
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
1. CPP 2	3	0
Sub Total	3	0
Total	106	27

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - SFEC - 1: 84.310A

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: The Prichard Committee for Academic Excellence (U310A180004)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. 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—
 - (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:

n/a

Weaknesses:

n/a

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of Management Plan/Project Personnel

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the services to be provided by 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—
 - (1) 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.
 - (2) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project involve the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project services.
 - (3) 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.
 - (4) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel.

Strengths:

n/a

Weaknesses:

n/a

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

1. The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources for the proposed project. In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers—

- (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:

n/a

Weaknesses:

n/a

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers:

- (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible.
- (2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.
- (3) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce promising evidence (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)) about the project's effectiveness.

Strengths:

(1) For Year 1, the applicants make clear connections between the methods of evaluation and objective performance measures. They detail the evaluation methods and performance measures in a table (Figure 11) that is organized by project goals and objectives (e62-e65), and the evaluation approaches include both qualitative and quantitative methods. For instance, Goal 1 is "to increase students' literacy, development, and academic achievement," and one of two objectives related to that goal is to "increase the number/percentage of students entering kindergarten ready to learn." One of three performance measures aligned with that objective is an "increase in the number of parents receiving services who report capacity to work with schools effectively in meeting children's academic and developmental needs". The quantitative data associated with that performance measure include service logs, family and school surveys, and training agenda/attendance rosters; and the qualitative data associated with that performance measure include Regional Center progress reports, school Board meeting reports, interviews, observations, and focus groups (e62).

(2) The applicants propose a sound plan for an independent evaluator to lead the project evaluation (e66-e67). The independent evaluator is familiar with SFEC and Kentucky public schools and is an experienced program evaluator. Her responsibilities include the provision of formative feedback to suggest and inform modifications in the project plan and the assessment of the ways and extent to which project goals are being met. The evaluator will provide quarterly written updates on data collection and project implementation, annual written progress reports, and an annual summative assessment of progress toward project goals (e66).

(3) The applicants propose assessing the Family Literacy Program, a key project component, using a well-developed quasi-experimental, pre-post, nonequivalent group design (e68). The primary goals of this Family Literacy Program are to improve student achievement and school performance and to increase high-quality educational options available to families, and this study design will allow for an examination of the effects of the program on related outcomes, including kindergarten readiness, reading and family engagement (e69). Running from Year 2 through Year 5, the study design includes a strong longitudinal component (e69). The intervention sample will include students who are participants in the program (intervention group) and students who are not participating in the program who, using matching criteria, will be selected from non-SFEC schools in the state (e69). The thorough study design includes a plan to employ statistical controls for background variables to mitigate selection bias (e71). If well implemented, this study can produce moderate evidence of the program's effectiveness.

Weaknesses:

(1) It is not clear how often the data detailed in Figure 11 (e62-e65) will be collected nor who will be responsible for collecting it. Additionally, it is not clear which project participants will be included in the analysis samples (e.g., which parents, which teachers), nor how they will be selected. Also, Figure 12, entitled "data collection timeline and instruments" (e65), describes additional data to be collected (i.e., different from those which are described in Figure 11), but these data are not linked with performance measures or outcomes. Figure 12 data are described in terms of broad "evaluation dimensions," and examples include characteristics of regional cohorts and participant profiles. The timeline portion of Figure 12 runs from October to April (7 months). The evaluation plan does not extend beyond April of Year 1. It is not clear whether the Year 1 evaluation methods will be appropriate in Years 2 through 5 because the project activities for Years 2 through 5 are not detailed (e49).

(2) No weaknesses were found.

(3) No weaknesses were found.

Reader's Score: 27

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority 1 - Competitive Preference Priority 1a or 1b

1. The Secretary gives priority to projects that are designed to--

(a) Create SFECs that will provide direct services to parents and families through evidence-based (as defined in the notice inviting applications, NIA) activities.

(b) Provide families with evidence-based (as defined in the NIA) strategies for promoting literacy. This may include providing families with access to books or other physical or digital materials or content about how to support their child's reading development, or providing family literacy activities (as defined in section 203(9) of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act).

Note: An application will not receive points for both (a) and (b) under Competitive Preference Priority 1.

Strengths:

n/a

Weaknesses:

1(b)

The applicant cites two intervention reports prepared by the WWC in application for competitive preference priority 1(b). The first report, published in 2006, describes the effects of Phonological Awareness Training plus Letter Knowledge Training on print knowledge, phonological processing and early reading/writing, and oral language. While the report finds positive effects of the intervention on print knowledge and potentially positive effects on phonological processing and early reading/writing, it also finds potentially negative effects on oral language (page 1). For this reason, the intervention report does not meet the promising evidence eligibility requirement that a cited intervention report include a positive effect or potentially positive effect on an outcome with no reporting of a negative effect or potentially negative effect on an outcome (page 30434 of SFEC NIA).

The outcome for which the second intervention report cited a favorable effect of Dialogic Reading is oral language, which is not an outcome measure of the proposed project (e19). For this reason, the intervention report does not meet the promising evidence eligibility requirements.

Reader's Score: **0**

Competitive Preference Priority 2 - Competitive Preference Priority 2

1. The Secretary gives priority to projects that are designed to provide families with the information and tools they need to make important decisions regarding the educational choice (as defined in the NIA) that is most appropriate for their children.

Strengths:

n/a

Weaknesses:

n/a

Reader's Score: **0**

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/20/2018 01:58 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/20/2018 07:54 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: The Prichard Committee for Academic Excellence (U310A180004)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	28
Quality of Management Plan/Project Personnel		
1. Management/Personel	20	16
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Resources	20	20
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	30	0
Sub Total	100	64
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
Competitive Preference Priority 1a or 1b		
1. CPP 1(a) or CPP 1(b)	3	0
Sub Total	3	0
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
1. CPP 2	3	3
Sub Total	3	3
Total	106	67

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - SFEC - 1: 84.310A

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: The Prichard Committee for Academic Excellence (U310A180004)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. 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—

- (1) The extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework.
- (2) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project reflect up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice.
- (3) The extent to which the proposed project is designed to build capacity and yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance.

Strengths:

1. The applicant provides a robust discussion of the capacity-building conceptual framework and its components. For example, the applicant indicates that the framework is applicable cradle-to-career and will support student achievement, inform families about educational options and support school improvement (e36).
2. The applicant conducted an exhaustive research and literature review with input of students, parents, educators, partners, and policy-makers. As a result, the research-based Dual Capacity-Building Framework for Family School Partnerships is the foundation of the work. Additionally, the project relies on findings of Having Their Say: Parents Describe How and Why They are Engaged in Their Children's Learning, A Match on Dry Grass: Community Organizing as a Catalyst for School Reform, and Debunking the Myth of the Hard to Reach Parent. The project adheres to the complementary learning approach of the Global Family Research Project (e39). Services to be provided by the SFEC include the exemplary practices elucidated in the research and literature review. For example, curriculum development for parents and school personnel and professional development for teachers aimed at fostering family engagement in schools will reflect the importance of parent participation at school and organize families to focus on school performance and accountability. All activities reflect the effectiveness of integrated supports in promoting children's learning and contributing to their school success.
3. The proposed project is designed to build capacity and yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance. Specifically, the applicant plans to formalize a "sustainability" plan. The sustainability plan will be developed in collaboration with the project's core partners and supporters with the intention to sustain and continue the work of the KY SFEC (e44).

Weaknesses:

2. The relationship to current knowledge and research does not involve current research. For example, Having Their Say: Parents Describe How and Why They are Engaged in Their Children's Learning was published in 2002 (e39).

Selection Criteria - Quality of Management Plan/Project Personnel

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the services to be provided by 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—
 - (1) 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.
 - (2) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project involve the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project services.
 - (3) 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.
 - (4) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel.

Strengths:

1. The applicant provides adequate information on how it will ensure diversity of perspectives. Specifically, the project will establish an Advisory Committee that will include representatives of the education, business and non-profit sections including but not limited to students and parents of diverse backgrounds and abilities; early childhood care professionals; teachers; community organizations that serve African American, Latino, and refugee students and families and non-English speaking populations; adult educators; postsecondary education representatives; college access outreach programs, school administrators, business representatives, and representatives from Kentucky's Dept. of Education and Council on Postsecondary Education (e45).

2. The plan to partner with three well-established state organizations can provide quick start-up, effective implementation of activities, and sustainability (e47). Each of the partner organizations will establish a Regional Family Engagement Center that will focus on a particular region of the state. Regions have been selected based on high-need populations within the state. Regional Centers will serve differing geographic regions to target services to specific high-need populations in rural, urban and suburban communities and will leverage existing relationships and partnerships to determine parental needs and the best means for delivery of services to address such needs. Regional SFEC partners include: (a) Partners for Education who will focus on serving low-income families and schools in Appalachian Kentucky; (b) Children, Inc., who will focus on serving low-income families and underserved minority families including Hispanic, Urban Appalachian, and English Language Learning families in northern Kentucky; and (c) the National Center for Families Learning (NCFL) who will focus on serving African American and low-income families in Louisville (Jefferson County), Kentucky's largest urban area (e47).

The plan includes strong involvement and support from the KY Dept. of ED (KDE)(e114-e115). KDE will: (a) work with LEAs, schools, educators and parents to determine parental needs and the best means for delivery of services to address such needs; (b) engage in policy discussions and initiatives as a member of the KY SFEC Advisory Committee to identify and remove barriers to family engagement in education at all levels and support school reform efforts; (c) connect the KY SFEC and its regional partners with LEAs and schools as a primary resource for professional development in family engagement practices and programming; (d) share online resources developed through KY SFEC efforts and networks with LEAs, schools, CBOs and partner agencies; and (e) provide access to relevant data for program evaluation purposes (e48).

3. The management plan and operational timeline and personnel responsibilities to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, are articulated for Year One (e49).

4. The qualifications, relevant training and experience of the Principal Investigator (PI) are sound. For example, the PI has significant expertise in developing public police agendas, advancing policy initiatives, and advocating for the most underserved and underrepresented members of the community (e51).

Weaknesses:

1. The project should include a representative from KY Parent Training and Information Center, the state's federally funded PTI authorized under IDEA to ensure perspective of children and youth with disabilities and their parents/families and also to leverage the PTI's knowledge regarding parent/family engagement. This could be done by including a PTI representative on the project's Advisory Committee.
2. Coordination across the three regional family engagement centers (e54) could prove challenging, particularly with only one full-time employee serving in the role of the project director (e52).
3. Details for Year's 2-5 in the proposed timeline are not specific, making it difficult to determine what the applicant will be doing within the project beyond year one. The applicant states that it anticipates that the schedule of activities in Years 2-5 to be similar to Year 1 (e49). However, a detailed work plan showing the activities in Years 2-5 would be necessary to understand the full scope of the project.
4. The specific qualifications of the key personnel of the project partners (e55-e56) are not addressed. The applicant notes that the core partners have a direct role in the delivery of grant services and/or the integration of project outcomes (e54). Therefore, given the substantial responsibilities assigned to the core partners, ensuring that they have adequate qualifications, including relevant training and experience, would be essential to the success of the project.

Reader's Score: 16

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

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

Strengths:

1. The relevance and commitment of each of the proposed project partners is clearly defined and well documented through preliminary MOUs, including a commitment of funds in years 2-5 as required by the NIA (e116-e121). For example, the applicant notes that the partners have a direct role in the delivery of grant services and/or the integration of project outcomes and that they partners have outlined their financial commitment to provide match funds. Each of the project partners have demonstrated experience and capacity. For example, the mission of Partners for Education (PFE) is to ensure all Appalachian students succeed at school and they recognize that fulfilling that mission requires one essential partner: families. By building relationships with parents, grandparents and other care givers, PFE creates a foundation for educational success for 41,000 young people and their families in the Appalachian region of Kentucky (e55). Children Inc. is a highly rated nonprofit provider in child care, family support, and school age services with a 40-year history of serving Northern Kentucky. Children Inc. partners with school districts who have a high percentage of children from low-income families and underrepresented minority families and annually serves more than 3,000 students and families. Children, Inc. has been engaging Hispanic families for more than 15 years through H.A.N.D.S. home

visitation program and the school-based Leadership Scholars parent engagement program. National Center for Families Learning (NCFL) has led family literacy and engagement efforts across the United States for nearly three decades. NCFL currently partners with Jefferson County Public Schools (JCPS) and community-based organizations to engage staff and families in intergenerational learning opportunities across a continuum of intensity and duration (e56).

2. The applicant indicates that the goals of the program are ambitious but attainable and that it will meet the project objectives by providing high-impact activities and services to families and schools and offering technical assistance on engaging families to low-income, high-need school districts and community-based organizations. The five-year budget is linked to the project goals, competitive priorities, and objectives and the costs are reasonable in relation to the outcomes to be achieved (e58-e59).

3. The applicant provides adequate evidence that the costs in relation to the number of persons to be served is reasonable. For example, the applicant predicts that activities will impact 656,588 students. The cost per student is less than \$1.52 per year (e61). Students across the state will benefit from activities aimed at increasing literacy skills, improved readiness to enter kindergarten, and through increased parent engagement in activities to improve student academic achievement and development needs. Students will also benefit from improved parent awareness regarding educational choice.

Weaknesses:

1. No weaknesses found.
2. No weaknesses found.
3. No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers:
 - (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible.
 - (2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.
 - (3) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce promising evidence (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)) about the project's effectiveness.

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority 1 - Competitive Preference Priority 1a or 1b

1. The Secretary gives priority to projects that are designed to--

- (a) Create SFECs that will provide direct services to parents and families through evidence-based (as defined in the notice inviting applications, NIA) activities.
- (b) Provide families with evidence-based (as defined in the NIA) strategies for promoting literacy. This may include providing families with access to books or other physical or digital materials or content about how to support their child's reading development, or providing family literacy activities (as defined in section 203(9) of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act).

Note: An application will not receive points for both (a) and (b) under Competitive Preference Priority 1.

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority 2 - Competitive Preference Priority 2

1. The Secretary gives priority to projects that are designed to provide families with the information and tools they need to make important decisions regarding the educational choice (as defined in the NIA) that is most appropriate for their children.

Strengths:

The applicant provides a detailed narrative regarding the difference in educational choices across age/grade spans and how the project will provide families with the information and tools they need to make important decisions regarding educational choice (e27). Each "regional center" will tailor its information to the region and also provide ratings of the options available (e28).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were found.

Reader's Score: 3

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/20/2018 07:54 AM