

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/24/2018 04:30 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: University of Hawaii (U310A180056)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	30	28
<b>Quality of Management Plan/Project Personnel</b>		
1. Management/Personel	20	18
<b>Adequacy of Resources</b>		
1. Resources	20	15
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	30	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	61
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1a or 1b</b>		
1. CPP 1(a) or CPP 1(b)	3	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	3	0
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
1. CPP 2	3	3
<b>Sub Total</b>	3	3
<b>Total</b>	106	64

# Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - SFEC - 2: 84.310A

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

Applicant: University of Hawaii (U310A180056)

## 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 proposed project will be guided by the frameworks of Dual Capacity-Building Framework for Family-School Partnerships (Mapp & Kuttner, 2013) and PTA National Standards for Family-School Partnership: An Implementation Guide (National PTA, 2009). These frameworks are evidence-based and incorporate up-to-date effective strategies. Some of the guiding principles are: families will experience the school environment as welcoming, effective school-family communication, and families and schools will share power. The selection of these frameworks are well suited for the proposed project. (p. 4-8)
- (2) The applicant provides a thorough description of how their services align with up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practices. For example, the critical aspect of family engagement is sustainability (Geller, 2016) and education policies and programs are most effective with meaningful family and community input (Warren, Mapp & Kuttner, 2015). (p. 6-7)
- (3) The proposal is designed to build capacity/ The intentional strategies are: building statewide infrastructure and policy for systemic family engagement, overall commitments and involvements of Hawaii's Department of Education, and intentional efforts to make the proposed program permanent entity and create long term State commitment through legislation, (p. 16) The State of Hawaii, Department of Education has committed through their MOU to pursue formalization of the Advisory Council of the Hawaii Family Engagement Center, supported with state funds, after the grant cycle. (p. e61)

#### Weaknesses:

- (3) The applicant does not provide enough detailed information on the sustainability of the project. It was difficult to evaluate this portion of the criteria due to the lack of information.

Reader's Score: 28

### 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 has demonstrated their commitment to ensuring that diverse perspectives are included in the operation of the proposed project, including all stakeholders. For example, the applicant will establish an advisory committee. The advisory committee is directed by statute and is parent-majority. The University of Hawaii will take the charge to create the advisory committee ensuring the makeup reflects a diverse perspective including parents, teachers, business community, and a wide variety of people. (p. 7,22, e60)
- (2) The applicant's partners are appropriate to ensure the successful implementation of the proposed project. The two main partners are the University of Hawaii's Center on Disability Studies (HIDOE) and Leadership in Disabilities and Achievement of Hawaii (LDAH). The MOU's clearly describe the roles and responsibilities of these agencies. For example, HIDOE will help to promote and connect the efforts of the project statewide and establish professional communities. They will also identify evidence-based practices and interventions suitable for enhancing family engagement. (p.e60-e61)
- (3) The applicant has a succinct management plan which includes appropriate activities, timelines, milestones and defined responsibilities. The applicant has internal procedures designed to optimize the management of the project. Weekly and monthly meetings will ensure strong communication of activities, while strong documentation will strengthen the overall quality of the project. (p. 16-23)
- (4) The qualifications of staff is exemplary and demonstrates the strong possibility of full and successful implementation of the project. The Principal Investigator has a wealth of experience in program implementation, evaluation and quality assurance. The Co-Principal has experience evaluating federal education programs and one consultant has research experience in bridging the gap between families and schools. Additionally, she has over 16 years' experience serving as a school outreach counselor and teacher. (p. 23-26, e68-e112)

**Weaknesses:**

- (3) The management plan does not demonstrate the ability to achieve the objectives on time and within budget. There is no clear indication to what extent partners will work effectively and meet the projects objectives. (p. 16-23)

**Reader's Score:** 18

**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 demonstrates the strength of their commitment for the proposed project and to implement the project successfully. The Center on Disability Studies (CDS) has a plethora of research, evidence-based strategies and resources and policies centered on disabilities. CDS Media Center provides accessibility technology to people with disabilities and will share those expertise to the project. These are just a few organizations committed to the project and providing resources and expertise, while building capacity for the project. (p. 27-32)

(2) The cost requested in this proposal are reasonable as it relates to the nature and scope of the project. This application is unique in the fact that all schools in the state are under one LEA. This allows for the applicant to pull together all of the needed resources under one umbrella and advance the ability to build capacity. All partners have agreed to harness their resources which eliminate duplication and provide a cost-effective project.(p. 32-33, e131-e136)

**Weaknesses:**

(3) It was unclear how many families or students would be served by this project. This information would have been useful to reasonable address this criteria.

**Reader's Score:** 15

**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:**

Not applicable

**Weaknesses:**

Not applicable

**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:**

Not applicable

**Weaknesses:**

Not applicable

**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 demonstrates that it will give priority to projects designed to encourage educational choice. The Hawaii Families As Allies has decades of experience in conducting workshops and providing supports designed to give parents of children with disabilities the attitudes, skills, and knowledge they need to understand the education system, effectively collaborate with educators, and participate in their child's Individual Education Plan (IEP) meetings, including planning for the transition to adulthood. The applicant will adopt these approaches for use with parents of children who have high needs besides those associated with disabilities. The applicant will support educational choice include encouraging educators participating in Community of Practice cohorts to propose home-school partnership projects in support of parents in making choices at transition points. (p. 15)

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses identified in this section.

**Reader's Score:**      3

---

<b>Status:</b>	Submitted
<b>Last Updated:</b>	08/24/2018 04:30 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/22/2018 06:56 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: University of Hawaii (U310A180056)

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

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

# Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - SFEC - 2: 84.310A

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

Applicant: University of Hawaii (U310A180056)

## 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. The applicant provides the foundation for their comprehensive formative / process evaluation in the Management / Work Plan. There are measurable and observable activities and measurements clearly identified and directly aligned with the projects Goals and organized by each of the program objectives. Specific identified objective performance measures will be assessed annually and are clearly described. Some of the PMs that will be tracked include the counting of relevant participant contacts, and participation with the Technical Assistance and Professional Development activities; the number of HFEC products developed; the number of surveys, interviews, and focus groups completed. In addition to participant quality ratings, which will be summarized in quantitative terms, the Evaluation Team will also periodically gather qualitative data through focus groups. (pgs. 16-22, 33-35)
2. The evaluation design clearly addresses how the applicant will provide continuous and ongoing quality improvement that will help to ensure that the delivery of their HFEC TA, PD, and products are meeting the needs of the

community. The process evaluation includes a quarterly review of the overall progress towards implementing and meeting the observable and measurable objectives in the Management Plan with a direct focus on identifying problems noted from the original plan. The Evaluation Team will use a data-driven discussion approach with Program leadership of the project partners. Discussions and modifications will be based on identifying the expected outcomes (critical behaviors) for parents and educators and supports in place or needed to achieve the changes. Relevant personnel will be involved in determining reasons for identified difficulties and strategic planning to address them. Corrective actions and changes may involve training, revised staffing, additional resources, resolving issues with outside entities, or other steps. Results of corrective actions will be assessed in the future. (pgs. 36-37)

3. The applicant clearly discusses how they attempt to meet the What Works Clearinghouse requirements and standards for identifying evidence-based conclusions and they will attempt to meet the standards for quasi-experimental and correlational designs as specified in the standards. The applicant states that they will use comparison groups as they implement this proposal. Comparison groups may consist of different school complex areas, different schools, different student groups within a school, different family groups within a community. They state that they will provide the foundation for generating promising evidence by identifying and prioritizing quasi-experimental opportunities using matched comparison groups; prioritizing correlational studies using high quality data; developing measures and instruments for assessing and comparing outcomes; establishing working relationships with research partners; establishing a comprehensive strategic research plan with timelines over Years 2-5, and obtaining initial IRB approvals. (pgs. 37-39)

#### **Weaknesses:**

1. None noted
2. None noted
3. The applicant does not adequately provide a conclusive rigorous Research Design that they will actually implement in order to meet the requirements of the WWC. They state that they will attempt to implement one of the many listed Design programs at a later time and then demonstrate evidence-based. The Research Design needs to be clearly written and aligned to the existing plans and evaluation design as the program is being developed.

**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:**

##### **CPP 1a**

The applicant clearly identifies primary evidence-based research articles that contain evidence-based conclusions that they use to guide their Hawaii Family Engagement Center (HFEC) grant proposal. The conclusion includes statistically significant positive levels of student development and achievement that have been tied directly to various forms of parent engagement in their children's education including parental expectations, aspirations, parental guidance, parenting style, home learning activities, supervision/monitoring, and school-based participation and communication (Hill & Tyson, 2009;

Jeynes, 2016a; Jeynes 2016b; Raikes, et al., 2006; Senechal & Young, 2008; Wang, Hill, & Hofkens, 2014).

In addition, they quote that success requires building capacity for all key stakeholder groups (Bolivar & Chrispeels, 2011; Mapp & Kuttner, 2013). (Pgs. 10-11, 14-15, 31, pg. 6 lists of articles.)

#### CPP 1b

The applicant clearly addresses the CPP 1b by providing details about how they will promote Literacy to meet the Competitive Preference Priority 1(b). They have searched the WWC website and located a WWC practice guide, Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding in Kindergarten Through 3rd Grade (2016), that includes four evidence-based recommendations for developing foundational reading skills. Among the four recommendations, two were assigned a strong level of evidence, one moderate level of evidence, and one minimum level of evidence. The practice guide has two accompanying publications: Tips for Supporting Reading Skills at Home and Evidence on Tips for Supporting Reading Skills at Home. The practices described in the tips correspond to the recommendations. (Foorman, B., Beyler, N., Borradaile, K., Coyne, M., Denton, C. A., Dimino, J., Furgeson, J., Hayes, L., Henke, J., Justice, L., Keating, B., Lewis, W., Sattar, S., Streke, A., Wagner, R., & Wissel, S. (2016)).

Another evidence-based document provided by the applicant includes 'Foundational skills to support reading for understanding in kindergarten through 3rd grade' (NCEE 2016-4008). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance (NCEE), Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from the NCEE website: <http://whatworks.ed.gov>.

The applicant has provided qualified evidence-based references for both CPP 1a and CPP 1b. The NIA allows points to be awarded only for CPP1 a or b. Following the review, points are awarded for CPP1a, but it is also notable that the applicant response to CPP1b meets the criteria as well.

#### Weaknesses:

None noted

**Reader's Score:** 3

#### 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:** 08/22/2018 06:56 PM



Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/24/2018 04:04 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: University of Hawaii (U310A180056)

Reader #3: \*\*\*\*\*

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	30	25
<b>Quality of Management Plan/Project Personnel</b>		
1. Management/Personel	20	18
<b>Adequacy of Resources</b>		
1. Resources	20	15
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	30	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	58
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1a or 1b</b>		
1. CPP 1(a) or CPP 1(b)	3	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	3	0
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
1. CPP 2	3	3
<b>Sub Total</b>	3	3
<b>Total</b>	106	61

# Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - SFEC - 2: 84.310A

Reader #3: \*\*\*\*\*

Applicant: University of Hawaii (U310A180056)

## 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:

The applicant provides clear and convincing evidence to demonstrate the extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities (pg e22-e23). In addition, the applicant provides a description of how HFEC will provide evidence-based programs, activities, and TA that are designed to align with six guiding principles that reflect the six National PTA standards. The applicant thoroughly demonstrates the extent to which services to be provided reflect current knowledge from research and effective practice (pg e24). The applicant describes that technical assistance and professional development will be driven by the community of practice model of support (pg e31).

#### Weaknesses:

The applicant does not provide sufficient detail in demonstrating 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. The applicant does not provide sufficient detail in describing program activities that will support building a statewide infrastructure and policy for systemic family engagement or long term State commitment to family engagement through legislation. On page e34, the applicant does not identify or describe specific strategies that will be implemented to build a statewide infrastructure and policy for systemic family engagement.

Reader's Score: 25

### 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:**

The applicant provides great detail in describing numerous strategies that will be used to employ and advance persons with disabilities and/or minority status for the Hawaii Family Engagement Center Project. The applicant provides complete and detailed evidence demonstrating the adequacy of the HFEC Management Plan to achieve proposed project objectives on time including timelines and milestones for accomplishing project tasks. The applicant provides a detailed description of the internal procedures designed to facilitate optimum project management (pg e41). The applicant describes procedures such as weekly staff meetings to ensure coordination of efforts and adherence to guiding principles and plans. The applicant provides a thorough description of the qualifications of key project personnel (pgs e41-e44). The applicant describes key project personnel and such as the PI and her wealth of experience in program implementation, evaluation, and quality assurance.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant does not provide adequate detail in describing the extent to which the services to be provided by the project involve the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project services. The application would be strengthened with the incorporation of more detail with regard to the role and involvement of LDAH.

**Reader's Score: 18**

**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:**

The applicant provides a detailed description of the three primary partners and list of organizations that have provided letters of support that will serve as resources for HFEC (pgs e50-e51). The applicant plans to partner with the Center on Disability Studies, HIDEOE, and Leadership in Disabilities and Achievement of Hawaii. The applicant describes that existing CDS, HIDEOE, LDAH, and various non-profit partner programs will be leveraged and coordinated to maximize use of existing resources.

**Weaknesses:**

The application would be strengthened by more specific detail with regard to project costs related to the number of persons to be served and anticipated results and benefits.

**Reader's Score: 15**

## 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 numerous examples of program activities geared toward providing families with the information and tools they need to make important decisions regarding the educational choice that is most appropriate for their children (pg e33). The applicant describes encouraging educators participating in Community of Practice cohorts to propose home-school partnership projects in support of parents in making choices at transition points.

**Weaknesses:**

There were no weaknesses identified in this section.

**Reader's Score:**     **3**

---

**Status:**               Submitted  
**Last Updated:**     08/24/2018 04:04 PM