

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/02/2024 03:34 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Lake County Regional Office of Education (S411B240005)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	15	0
Strategy to Scale		
1. Strategy to Scale	40	0
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	20	0
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	25	22
Sub Total	100	22
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. Promoting Equity	3	0
Sub Total	3	0
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
1. Impact of COVID-19	3	0
Sub Total	3	0
Total	106	22

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - Mid-Phase - 2: 84.411B

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Lake County Regional Office of Education (S411B240005)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. The Secretary considers the significance of the proposed project. In determining the significance of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 0

Sub

1. The extent to which the proposed project involves the development and demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies.

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Strategy to Scale

1. The Secretary considers the strategy to scale the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 0

Sub

1. (1) The extent to which the applicant identifies a specific strategy or strategies that address a particular barrier or barriers that prevented the applicant, in the past, from reaching the level of scale that is proposed in the application.

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Sub

Reader's Score: 0

2. (2) 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.

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

3. (3) The applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to bring the proposed project to scale on a national or regional level (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)) working directly, or through partners, during the grant period.

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

4. (4) The mechanisms the applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

5. (5) The likely utility of the products (such as information, materials processes, or techniques) that will result from the proposed project, including the potential for their being used effectively in a variety of other settings.

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

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 the following factors:

Reader's Score: 0

Sub

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

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

2. (2) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

3. (3) The extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs.

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 the following factors:

Reader's Score: 22

Sub

- 1. (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse standards without reservations as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbook (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)).**

Strengths:

The evaluation plan proposes a cluster-level RCT that is designed to meet the WWC standards without reservations (p.e35). In addition, by blocking randomization based on school-level characteristics (e.g., race/ethnicity, Title I status, discipline data), the study aims to ensure baseline equivalence, reducing potential confounding variables. Last, extensive data collection on both treatment and control schools, including baseline and ongoing measurements, ensures thorough monitoring of implementation and outcomes.

Weaknesses:

Some data, such as staff surveys and PL Platform logins, are self-reported, which can introduce bias or inaccuracies. In addition, the researchers do not anticipate possible school-level attrition, and there is therefore no provision for this possibility in the evaluation plan.

Reader's Score: 14

- 2. (2) The extent to which the evaluation will provide guidance about effective strategies suitable for replication or testing in other settings.**

Strengths:

The application refers to the generalizability of the results, given the wide variety of schools for implementation. In addition, moderator and mediator analyses will help identify for whom and under what conditions ISF-SHINE is most effective, providing nuanced insights for replication in different contexts (p.e38).

Weaknesses:

The application does not provide a specific plan for replicability of the program, beyond distribution through social media posts and other digital outlets (p.e26).

Reader's Score: 4

- 3. (3) The extent to which the evaluation plan clearly articulates the key project components, mediators, and outcomes, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.**

Strengths:

The application includes a clear and detailed logic model and a table of measures that clearly outlines the key components, mediators, and outcomes, providing a structured framework for the evaluation (p. e40). The plan also includes specific thresholds for implementation (e.g., 90% or greater implementation of each core PL component, at least one PL Platform log-in from all MTSS team members), ensuring measurable standards for acceptable implementation.

Weaknesses:

Developing thresholds during the refinement phase may introduce variability and uncertainty, potentially impacting the consistency of implementation across different schools.

Sub

Reader's Score: 4

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1

1. Competitive Preference Priority 1:

Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities: Implementers and Partners (up to 3 points)

Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate how the project will be implemented by or in partnership with one or more of the following entities:

- (a) Community colleges (as defined in the NIA)
- (b) Historically Black colleges and universities (as defined in the NIA)
- (c) Tribal Colleges and Universities (as defined in the NIA)
- (d) Minority-serving institutions (as defined in the NIA)

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 2

1. Competitive Preference Priority 2:

Addressing the Impact of COVID-19 on Students, Educators, and Faculty: Community Asset-Mapping and Needs Assessment and Evidence-Based Instructional Approaches and Supports (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 and the educators who serve them through 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; and
- (b) Using evidence-based instructional approaches and supports, such as professional development, coaching, ongoing support for educators, high-quality tutoring, expanded access to rigorous coursework and content across K-12, and expanded learning time to accelerate learning for students in ways that ensure all students have the opportunity to successfully meet challenging academic content standards without contributing to tracking or remedial courses.

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: **0**

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/02/2024 03:34 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/07/2024 07:12 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Lake County Regional Office of Education (S411B240005)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	15	15
Strategy to Scale		
1. Strategy to Scale	40	40
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	20	16
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	25	0
Sub Total	100	71
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. Promoting Equity	3	3
Sub Total	3	3
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
1. Impact of COVID-19	3	2
Sub Total	3	2
Total	106	76

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - Mid-Phase - 2: 84.411B

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Lake County Regional Office of Education (S411B240005)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. The Secretary considers the significance of the proposed project. In determining the significance of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 15

Sub

1. The extent to which the proposed project involves the development and demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies.

Strengths:

The significance of the project is appropriately described as the applicant intends to integrate the Interconnected Systems Framework: School Health and Interventions for Nurturing Excellence (ISF-SHINE) project model into the existing Multi-tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) and the Positive Behavior Interventions and Support (PBIS) model to enhance and support positive behaviors and school-based mental health in schools. The significance is further demonstrated as national data provided by the applicant indicates that upwards of 80% of those children and youth have unmet mental health treatment needs since COVID-19 (pgs. e11-e17).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Strategy to Scale

1. The Secretary considers the strategy to scale the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 40

Sub

1. (1) The extent to which the applicant identifies a specific strategy or strategies that address a particular barrier or barriers that prevented the applicant, in the past, from reaching the level of scale that is proposed in the application.

Sub

Strengths:

The applicant appropriately describes four barriers and clearly states how each barrier will be addressed. For example, the applicant states that schools have been unable to partner with necessary external mental health professionals. The applicant clearly describes plans to address the barrier by creating a free web-based, Interconnected System Framework professional learning model which will be made available to administrators, leadership teams, teachers, and all school staff in addition to external Mental Health staff and practices (pgs. e20-e21).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 10

- 2. (2) 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.**

Strengths:

The applicant appropriately describes the management plan for the project. The roles and responsibilities are clearly outlined and present a logical approach to ensuring tasks are assigned appropriately. For example, the University of Illinois-Chicago (UIC) C will collaborate with WestEd on all data collection activities given their proximity to schools and expertise in connecting with diverse communities. The timeline presents a detailed overview of the milestones and activities to be accomplished. For example, in Phase 2 of the implementation plan professional learning and coaching will be implemented by the applicant and Midwest PBIS in years 2-5 of the project (pgs. e23-e25).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 5

- 3. (3) The applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to bring the proposed project to scale on a national or regional level (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)) working directly, or through partners, during the grant period.**

Strengths:

The applicant's capacity is fully demonstrated as Lake County has implemented similar projects and has a strong track record of bringing system change to scale by working with local and regional education leaders. The applicant presents information clearly identifying the qualified personnel responsible for the project oversight and implementation. The Project Director will work with staff, school sites, and partners on the development and implementation of the project. The Project Director has experience implementing the Interconnected System Framework School Health and Interventions for Nurturing Excellence (ISF-SHINE) project as the model is currently being implemented in partnership with the Positive Behavior Interventions and Support (PBIS) Center (pgs. e25-e27).

Sub

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 10

4. **(4) The mechanisms the applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.**

Strengths:

The applicant presents a plan that is fully developed and includes partner co-led activities to ensure information is disseminated promptly. The activities include monthly social media posts and quarterly submissions to digital outlets such as practitioner websites, webinars, and podcasts. The annual presentations at national and regional conferences, the annual submission of scholarly research articles to peer-reviewed journals, and downloadable infographics and publications for practitioners will also be made available (pg. e25).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 10

5. **(5) The likely utility of the products (such as information, materials processes, or techniques) that will result from the proposed project, including the potential for their being used effectively in a variety of other settings.**

Strengths:

The applicant appropriately describes the potential for the information to be used effectively in a variety of other settings. The applicant clearly describes several venues by which the information will be available including the Interconnected System Framework School Health and Interventions for Nurturing Excellence (ISF-SHINE) team websites, practice and policy briefs, conference presentations, publications, and webinars. The website is free and will be available to a variety of stakeholders including educators, researchers, policymakers, and practitioners (pg. e27)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 5

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 the following factors:**

Reader's Score: 16

Sub

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

Sub

Strengths:

The conceptual framework for the project model is clearly described and research indicates that the Interconnected Systems Framework (ISF) is an evidence-based system designed to change the approach to school-based mental health (SMH). The incorporation of the ISF model into a multi-tiered system of support (MTSS) will improve the social and emotional well-being of all students and focus on promoting students' social, emotional, behavioral, and academic functioning. The ISF model is currently implemented and supported by the National PBIS Center of individual university researchers at many sites across the country making it difficult to scale. The applicant will work to scale the project within the targeted areas to support teacher and educator learning (pgs. e28-e30).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 5

2. (2) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.

Strengths:

The applicant presents goals and objectives for the project that are mostly measurable. For example, Objective 4.5. states that the applicant will disseminate ISF-SHINE model findings to researchers and policymakers. The applicant presents a logical and reasonable outcome which includes submitting 1 manuscript to peer-reviewed journals and presenting 1 session at national conferences annually (pgs. e29-e31).

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not demonstrate measurable goals and objectives for all of the project components/activities. For example, the outcomes for Objective 4.1. Building district and school capacity for sustaining ISF states that schools and districts will establish MOUs with community-based mental health organizations, train district coaches, and train school-based teams. However, no measures are presented to determine how this outcome will be met by the project (pgs. e29-e31).

Reader's Score: 3

3. (3) The extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs.

Strengths:

The applicant appropriately describes the demographic makeup of the proposed target population. The data indicates that 99.7% of the student population qualifies for the free and reduced lunch program and 88.3% of students are Hispanic (pg.e32).

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not provide data or information describing the mental health needs of Black and Latinx students in the targeted area where the project will be implemented which somewhat diminishes the effectiveness of the project design.

Reader's Score: 8

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 the following factors:

Reader's Score: 0

Sub

1. (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse standards without reservations as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbook (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)).

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

2. (2) The extent to which the evaluation will provide guidance about effective strategies suitable for replication or testing in other settings.

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

3. (3) The extent to which the evaluation plan clearly articulates the key project components, mediators, and outcomes, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1

1. Competitive Preference Priority 1:

Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities: Implementers and Partners

(up to 3 points)

Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate how the project will be implemented by or in partnership with one or more of the following entities:

- (a) Community colleges (as defined in the NIA)
- (b) Historically Black colleges and universities (as defined in the NIA)
- (c) Tribal Colleges and Universities (as defined in the NIA)
- (d) Minority-serving institutions (as defined in the NIA)

Strengths:

The applicant clearly describes plans to address Competitive Priority Preference 1. The plans include working with the University of Illinois-Chicago (UIC) (a minority-serving institution). The collaborative roles and responsibilities are appropriately described. For example, UIC will work with the project partner to collect all project data directly from districts and schools independent from the Lake County Regional Office of Education which will help to support the evaluation of the project for analysis and dissemination (pgs. e11, e22-e24).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 3

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 2

1. Competitive Preference Priority 2:

Addressing the Impact of COVID-19 on Students, Educators, and Faculty: Community Asset-Mapping and Needs Assessment and Evidence-Based Instructional Approaches and Supports (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 and the educators who serve them through 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; and**
- (b) Using evidence-based instructional approaches and supports, such as professional development, coaching, ongoing support for educators, high-quality tutoring, expanded access to rigorous coursework and content across K-12, and expanded learning time to accelerate learning for students in ways that ensure all students have the opportunity to successfully meet challenging academic content standards without contributing to tracking or remedial courses.**

Strengths:

The project will address the mental health needs of students. The project data reports that mental health issues have increased since COVID-19 occurred, and educators need more support to address this need. The evidence-based Interconnected Systems Framework (ISF) model will be incorporated in school-based mental health (SMH) into a multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS) to improve the social and emotional well-being of all students, with a focus on promoting students' social, emotional, behavioral, and academic functioning (pgs. e11-e12).

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not describe plans for conducting community asset mapping and needs assessments.

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/07/2024 07:12 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/02/2024 04:35 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Lake County Regional Office of Education (S411B240005)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	15	15
Strategy to Scale		
1. Strategy to Scale	40	40
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	20	18
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	25	0
Sub Total	100	73
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. Promoting Equity	3	3
Sub Total	3	3
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
1. Impact of COVID-19	3	2
Sub Total	3	2
Total	106	78

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - Mid-Phase - 2: 84.411B

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Lake County Regional Office of Education (S411B240005)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. The Secretary considers the significance of the proposed project. In determining the significance of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 15

Sub

1. The extent to which the proposed project involves the development and demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies.

Strengths:

The applicant's project involves the development of an Interconnected Systems Framework (ISF) by integrating PBIS and SMH to enhance services within the Multi-Tiered System of Supports framework. Furthermore, the applicant included a logic model diagram demonstrating the interconnectedness of multiple frameworks toward alignment (p. e71)

The applicant provides sufficient information about the need for an integrative strategy by providing information that PBIS (Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports) and SMH (School Mental Health) as valuable framework for addressing SEB (social, emotional, and behavioral) needs in schools. Furthermore, the applicant explains how both PBIS, a behavioral skills-focused and Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS), emphasizes data-based decision-making, effective teaming, and evidence-based practices across three tiers of prevention and intervention. (p. 11 & p. 12).

The applicant demonstrates how the ISF has shown promise in addressing students' SEB needs more cohesively as demonstrated by a National Institute of Justice (NIJ) funded randomized controlled trial (RCT). For example, the trial found that ISF increased student access to Tier 2 and Tier 3 supports, improved intervention delivery by community mental health clinicians, and reduced disciplinary issues compared to PBIS alone or PBIS with separate SMH clinicians. (p. e16)

Weaknesses:

None

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Strategy to Scale

1. The Secretary considers the strategy to scale the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 40

Sub

- 1. (1) The extent to which the applicant identifies a specific strategy or strategies that address a particular barrier or barriers that prevented the applicant, in the past, from reaching the level of scale that is proposed in the application.**

Strengths:

The applicant's proposal identifies and addresses four key barriers to scaling ISF: (1) The Current professional learning model is not ready for replication and scaling, (2) Schools struggle to implement PBIS with fidelity, (3) Schools having difficulties in partnering with external mental health professionals, and (4) School teams often lack the knowledge and skills needed to implement evidence-based MH prevention and interventions. (p. e19)

The participant's proposal describes a well-thought-out, collaborative strategy that address all four barriers. The applicant's proposal demonstrates the use of a planning and learning platform called, "ISF-SHINE PL Platform" a free web-based resource providing all necessary PL materials and resources. The platform serves as a one-stop resource for ISF-related information, enhancing accessibility and usability for schools. Collaboration with Katabasis, a non-profit organization of computer scientists, brings technical expertise that likely improves the quality and functionality of the ISF-SHINE PL Platform. (p. e20 & e21). Furthermore, the applicant provides a detailed table (Table 2. Proposed Adjustments to the Current ISF PL Model) showing current practices and proposed adjustment. (p. e21).

Weaknesses:

None

Reader's Score: 10

- 2. (2) 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.**

Strengths:

The applicant, Lake County Regional Office of Education (LCROE), will lead the project, manage federal reporting, and ensure on-time and on-budget completion. In addition, the proposal demonstrates how each ISF-SHINE partner has the experience and capacity to collaborate effectively, ensuring the project's success and exceeding objectives.

The adequacy of the management plan is strengthened by the applicant's detailed timeline of activities (Table 3) noting activities and milestones aligned to goals and objectives as well as yearly schedules. (p. e23)

The budget proposes an adequate overview of positions, responsibilities, event schedules inclusive of travel costs, and the percentage ranges of in-kind support over the five-year grant period. (p. e75-e80).

Weaknesses:

None

Reader's Score: 5

- 3. (3) The applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to bring the proposed project to scale on a national or regional**

Sub

level (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)) working directly, or through partners, during the grant period.

Strengths:

The applicant provides robust information demonstrating an effective management plan inclusive of financial and personal resources. The applicant effectively lists its key personnel along with corresponding roles, responsibilities, and qualifications (p. e25). The plan identifies each partner's role and specific service based on shared timelines and deliverables. For example, Midwest PBIS will collaborate with LCROE to refine and conduct all PL. Katabasis: Develops the web-based PL Platform and meets monthly with LCROE and Midwest PBIS. WestEd: Leads evaluation activities and meets bi-weekly with LCROE and weekly with UIC for data collection and analysis. UIC: Assists WestEd with data collection, leveraging their proximity to schools and expertise with diverse communities. (p. e25)

Weaknesses:

None

Reader's Score: 10

4. (4) The mechanisms the applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths:

The applicant's dissemination strategy is well-designed utilizing diverse platforms such as social media, podcasts, webpage hosting, and infographics to reach a broad audience. For example, regular updates through monthly, quarterly, and bi-annual channels ensure consistent information flow. (p. e26) Additionally, targeting academic and professional audiences through peer-reviewed publications and conference presentations will ensure credibility and scientific validation. This multi-faceted approach ensures wide dissemination of ISF-SHINE findings, enhancing visibility and promoting the adoption of successful practices. (p. e26 & 27)

The applicant also plans to leverage strategic partnerships to disseminate research findings with Midwest PBIS and the PBIS National Center will share learnings through Practice Briefs and presentations at the National PBIS Forum, reaching many administrators and teachers annually and WestEd will access resources like the National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI) to disseminate findings to state education agencies. (p. e26 & e27)

Weaknesses:

None

Reader's Score: 10

5. (5) The likely utility of the products (such as information, materials processes, or techniques) that will result from the proposed project, including the potential for their being used effectively in a variety of other settings.

Strengths:

The applicant provides detailed information as to how ISF-SHINE) will develop and provide, for free, the resources necessary for ISF implementation to a diverse range of audiences, including researchers, policymakers, and practitioners.

The resources include the ISF PL Platform, team websites, practice and policy briefs, conference presentations, publications, and webinars. Further, this project will identify in which educational contexts ISF-SHINE professional learning sessions are most efficacious and under what conditions, providing information about how the professional learning platform and sessions can be used more broadly in a variety of settings and conditions to support local needs. (p. e27)

Sub

Weaknesses:

None

Reader's Score: 5

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 the following factors:**

Reader's Score: 18

Sub

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

Strengths:

The applicant provides evidence of a well-developed logic model showing the ISF Professional Learning conceptual framework which suggests Interconnected Systems Framework (ISF) schools will have better-functioning Multi-Tiered System of Supports teams, evidenced by the inclusion of partners and improved data-based decision-making, leading to identification of students with SEBA (Social, Emotional, Behavioral, Academic) challenges. (p. e71)

Additionally, ISF schools are expected to excel in student screening and identification through frequent SEBA data reviews and high-quality progress monitoring and training. Finally, the expanded continuum of services in ISF schools shows the potential to enhance the delivery of evidence-based practices. This comprehensive and detailed framework outlines clear pathways from intervention to improved outcomes, demonstrating its quality and coherence. (p. e28)

The applicant anticipates development of the professional learning platform as a one-stop resource for ISF-related information, enhancing accessibility and usability for schools. Collaboration with Katabasis, a non-profit organization of computer scientists, brings technical expertise that likely improves the quality and functionality of the ISF-SHINE PL Platform. (p. e20 & e21).

Weaknesses:

None

Reader's Score: 5

- 2. (2) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.**

Strengths:

The applicant provides a comprehensive, detailed table (Table 6. Measurable Goals and Objective) with four goals: (Goal 1) Refine ISF Professional Learning for Scale-Up and Replicability, (Goal 2) Improve ISF Systems Implementation, (Goal 3) Improve Student Well-being, Behavior, and Academic Achievement, and (Goal 4) Develop Mechanisms for Sustainability and Scale, along with multiple objectives, outputs, and outcomes guiding ISF-SHINE. (p. e29 – e31)

Sub

Weaknesses:

None

Reader's Score: 5

3. (3) The extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs.

Strengths:

The project design is mostly appropriate to the needs of the target population which includes students with mental health challenges, diverse racial/ethnic backgrounds, low-income households, and disabilities. The applicant proposes to use a universal screener and demographic data for identifying high-needs students provides a systematic and evidence-based methodology. (p. e32)

Weaknesses:

Specific data regarding the availability of local mental health data for the target population is missing which is essential for accurately identifying and addressing student needs. Providing detailed local data ensures the targeted and effective implementation of mental health interventions, making sure that resources are allocated based on students' multifaceted needs.

The proposal relies heavily on the accuracy and effectiveness of a universal screener. Consideration of using a multi-gated review process has the potential to mitigate a risk of over-identifying student needs, potentially skewing the identification process and the support provided.

Reader's Score: 8

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 the following factors:

Reader's Score: 0

Sub

1. (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse standards without reservations as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbook (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)).

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

Sub

2. (2) The extent to which the evaluation will provide guidance about effective strategies suitable for replication or testing in other settings.

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

3. (3) The extent to which the evaluation plan clearly articulates the key project components, mediators, and outcomes, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1

1. Competitive Preference Priority 1:

Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities: Implementers and Partners (up to 3 points)

Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate how the project will be implemented by or in partnership with one or more of the following entities:

- (a) Community colleges (as defined in the NIA)
- (b) Historically Black colleges and universities (as defined in the NIA)
- (c) Tribal Colleges and Universities (as defined in the NIA)
- (d) Minority-serving institutions (as defined in the NIA)

Strengths:

The proposal provides evidence of support by the University of Illinois-Chicago (UIC) a federally designated minority-serving institution who will work with WestEd to collect all project data directly from districts and schools independent from Lake County Regional Office of Education (LCROE) and Midwest Positive Behavior Intervention and Support (Midwest PBIS). University of Illinois-Chicago (UIC) will be a critical evaluation partner with WestEd and provide additional support for the analysis and dissemination activities. (p. e12)

Weaknesses:

None

Reader's Score: 3

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 2

1. Competitive Preference Priority 2:

Addressing the Impact of COVID-19 on Students, Educators, and Faculty: Community Asset-Mapping and Needs Assessment and Evidence-Based Instructional Approaches and Supports (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 and the educators who serve them through 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; and

(b) Using evidence-based instructional approaches and supports, such as professional development, coaching, ongoing support for educators, high-quality tutoring, expanded access to rigorous coursework and content across K-12, and expanded learning time to accelerate learning for students in ways that ensure all students have the opportunity to successfully meet challenging academic content standards without contributing to tracking or remedial courses.

Strengths:

The applicant demonstrates the Interconnected Systems Framework: School Health and Interventions for Nurturing Excellence (ISF-SHINE) as a program that addresses the inequities in educational opportunities and outcomes in underserved communities, exacerbated by the pandemic, by providing a comprehensive approach to mental health through prevention, screening, and targeted intensive interventions. Supported by a team with significant expertise, experience, and enthusiasm, ISF-SHINE is positioned for successful implementation and impactful outcomes. (p. 12)

Weaknesses:

The proposal lacks specific details on how the program will address the varied and complex needs that have arisen. Community mapping and need assessments could strengthen this aspect.

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/02/2024 04:35 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/02/2024 01:27 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Lake County Regional Office of Education (S411B240005)

Reader #4: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	15	0
Strategy to Scale		
1. Strategy to Scale	40	0
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	20	0
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	25	23
Sub Total	100	23
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. Promoting Equity	3	0
Sub Total	3	0
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
1. Impact of COVID-19	3	0
Sub Total	3	0
Total	106	23

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - Mid-Phase - 2: 84.411B

Reader #4: *****

Applicant: Lake County Regional Office of Education (S411B240005)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. The Secretary considers the significance of the proposed project. In determining the significance of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 0

Sub

1. The extent to which the proposed project involves the development and demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies.

Strengths:

n/a

Weaknesses:

n/a

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Strategy to Scale

1. The Secretary considers the strategy to scale the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 0

Sub

1. (1) The extent to which the applicant identifies a specific strategy or strategies that address a particular barrier or barriers that prevented the applicant, in the past, from reaching the level of scale that is proposed in the application.

Strengths:

n/a

Weaknesses:

n/a

Sub

Reader's Score: 0

2. (2) 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.

Strengths:

n/a

Weaknesses:

n/a

Reader's Score: 0

3. (3) The applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to bring the proposed project to scale on a national or regional level (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)) working directly, or through partners, during the grant period.

Strengths:

n/a

Weaknesses:

n/a

Reader's Score: 0

4. (4) The mechanisms the applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths:

n/a

Weaknesses:

n/a

Reader's Score: 0

5. (5) The likely utility of the products (such as information, materials processes, or techniques) that will result from the proposed project, including the potential for their being used effectively in a variety of other settings.

Strengths:

n/a

Weaknesses:

n/a

Reader's Score: 0

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 the following factors:

Reader's Score: 0

Sub

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

Strengths:

n/a

Weaknesses:

n/a

Reader's Score: 0

2. (2) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.

Strengths:

n/a

Weaknesses:

n/a

Reader's Score: 0

3. (3) The extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs.

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 the following factors:

Reader's Score: 23

Sub

1. (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse standards without reservations as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbook (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)).

Strengths:

The proposed evaluation plan is fully articulated and designed to generate evidence about the intervention's efficacy which will meet WWC standards without reservations. The evaluation succeeds at this through proposing a school level RCT (including randomization), power analyses with manageable MDES, adjustments for clustering, and efforts to establish baseline equivalence using blocking (p.e33-40). A thorough list of outcome measures is provided in Appendix J (Table X) which provide evidence of prior evidence of validity and reliability of the measures. This plan proposes multiple outcome measures for both students and teachers to generate evidence across multiple domains.

Weaknesses:

The assumption of no school attrition seems unlikely to be achievable.

Reader's Score: 14

2. (2) The extent to which the evaluation will provide guidance about effective strategies suitable for replication or testing in other settings.

Strengths:

The evaluation plan is designed to provide robust guidance for future replication and testing of the intervention in other settings.

The plan includes detailed descriptions of their moderation analysis plans to provide guidance on how the program impact varies and aims to generate generalizable evidence through the large, diverse sample of schools (p.e38). Relatedly, the plan includes analysis of contextual and mediating factors, with aspirations to identify and improve the framework for areas it is found to be less effective (p.e38). The outlined qualitative listening sessions will help to support these efforts (p.e39).

The applicant appropriately provides plans for a cost analysis with robust analysis methods to generate cost information for potential adopters (p.e39).

Weaknesses:

None

Reader's Score: 5

3. (3) The extent to which the evaluation plan clearly articulates the key project components, mediators, and outcomes, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.

Strengths:

The evaluation plan includes clearly articulated key project components, mediators, and outcomes in the logic model (Appendix G, e71).

Weaknesses:

Thresholds for acceptable implementation are hypothesized in the evaluation plan but are not fully fleshed out to establish what is necessary implementation levels (p.e40).

Sub

Reader's Score: 4

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1

1. Competitive Preference Priority 1:

Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities: Implementers and Partners (up to 3 points)

Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate how the project will be implemented by or in partnership with one or more of the following entities:

- (a) Community colleges (as defined in the NIA)
- (b) Historically Black colleges and universities (as defined in the NIA)
- (c) Tribal Colleges and Universities (as defined in the NIA)
- (d) Minority-serving institutions (as defined in the NIA)

Strengths:

n/a

Weaknesses:

n/a

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 2

1. Competitive Preference Priority 2:

Addressing the Impact of COVID-19 on Students, Educators, and Faculty: Community Asset-Mapping and Needs Assessment and Evidence-Based Instructional Approaches and Supports (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 and the educators who serve them through 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; and
- (b) Using evidence-based instructional approaches and supports, such as professional development, coaching, ongoing support for educators, high-quality tutoring, expanded access to rigorous coursework and content across K-12, and expanded learning time to accelerate learning for students in ways that ensure all students have the opportunity to successfully meet challenging academic content standards without contributing to tracking or remedial courses.

Strengths:

n/a

Weaknesses:

n/a

Reader's Score: **0**

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/02/2024 01:27 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/02/2024 08:16 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Lake County Regional Office of Education (S411B240005)

Reader #5: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	15	15
Strategy to Scale		
1. Strategy to Scale	40	40
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	20	19
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	25	0
Sub Total	100	74
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. Promoting Equity	3	3
Sub Total	3	3
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
1. Impact of COVID-19	3	2
Sub Total	3	2
Total	106	79

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - Mid-Phase - 2: 84.411B

Reader #5: *****

Applicant: Lake County Regional Office of Education (S411B240005)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. The Secretary considers the significance of the proposed project. In determining the significance of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 15

Sub

1. The extent to which the proposed project involves the development and demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies.

Strengths:

The applicant thoroughly proposes promising new strategies and the significance of building upon existing strategies. The proposal adequately outlines the need to develop guidance on the systematic interconnection between PBIS and SMH through ISF (p. e15). The ISF will address the current limitations of both PBIS and SMH and improve the overall quality of services within and between the three tiers of MTSS (p. e15).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Strategy to Scale

1. The Secretary considers the strategy to scale the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 40

Sub

1. (1) The extent to which the applicant identifies a specific strategy or strategies that address a particular barrier or barriers that prevented the applicant, in the past, from reaching the level of scale that is proposed in the application.

Strengths:

The application identifies four barriers that has prevented the applicant in the past from reaching the level of scale and proposes four specific strategies to address them (p. e18).

The applicant adequately details the adjustments to the ISF PL model with a PBIS Tiered Fidelity Inventory infused

Sub

into the plan (p. e20-21) The applicant has substantially reduced the number of PL hours needed during the 3 years of implementation which is an effective strategy to scale the project.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 10

2. (2) 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.

Strengths:

The applicant adequately outlines the management plan (p e23-24). For example, LCROE will lead the project and federal reporting and Katabasis will create the web-based PL Platform (p. e23). The timeline in Table 3 is broken down into phases, yearly timeline and clearly names who is responsible for each milestone/activity as well as the corresponding goal and objective. For example, in phase 1 the LC and MP are responsible for the refining of ISF PL and the Pilot test while Kat is solely responsible for the development of the PL platform (p. e23).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 5

3. (3) The applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to bring the proposed project to scale on a national or regional level (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)) working directly, or through partners, during the grant period.

Strengths:

There is significant evidence that the applicant's capacity will allow this project to scale based on the qualified personnel and management capacity in Table 4 (p. e25). For example, a Licensed Clinical Social Worker (LCSW) has provided PL and coaching for the PBIS Center. The LCSW experience also include IES-Funded ISF projects (p. e25)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 10

4. (4) The mechanisms the applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths:

The proposal clearly states the mechanisms that the applicant will use to broadly disseminate the information from this project to support further development or replication. The application names six mechanisms for dissemination and includes examples of venues for each category and goals for frequency (monthly, quarterly, annually or bi-annually) (p. e27). One of the mechanisms that applicant addresses is social media and they propose monthly posts to disseminate the information of this project (p. e27).

Sub

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 10

5. (5) The likely utility of the products (such as information, materials processes, or techniques) that will result from the proposed project, including the potential for their being used effectively in a variety of other settings.

Strengths:

The applicant demonstrates that the products from this project will be accessible for other agencies and schools to use, free of charge. They will be hosted on their ISF PL Platform and team websites (p. e27). Throughout the proposal the applicant states that they will gather information on how the PL can be used more broadly in a variety of settings.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 5

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 the following factors:

Reader's Score: 19

Sub

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

Strengths:

The logic model for this project is thoroughly supported by research (p. e28). The applicant adequately justifies that a team-based approach to supporting students begins the process of increasing access to Tier 2 and Tier 3 supports and overall fidelity of interventions (Appendix G).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 5

2. (2) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.

Strengths:

The four goals and 21 objectives are clearly stated (p. e29-32). For example, Objective 3.4 anticipates that all students in schools implementing ISF demonstrate decreased discipline exclusions, and increased attendance, academic achievement, positive school climate, and well-being at the end of the school year (p. e31).

Sub

Weaknesses:

There are a few objectives outputs/outcomes that lack a measure. For example. 4.1 does not have a measurable target listed or timeline for completion.

Reader's Score: 4

3. (3) The extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs.

Strengths:

The applicant defines high-needs populations “as students experiencing MH challenges and not receiving the SMH support...” (p. e32). The proposal states that it will address the needs of this population of students by conducting a universal screener and using demographic data to better identify the students’ needs. The target population has a range of characteristics which the applicant proposes will allow for discovery of generalized knowledge (p. e32).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 10

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 the following factors:

Reader's Score: 0

Sub

1. (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project’s effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse standards without reservations as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbook (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)).

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

2. (2) The extent to which the evaluation will provide guidance about effective strategies suitable for replication or testing in other settings.

Strengths:

N/A

Sub

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

3. (3) The extent to which the evaluation plan clearly articulates the key project components, mediators, and outcomes, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1

1. Competitive Preference Priority 1:

Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities: Implementers and Partners (up to 3 points)

Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate how the project will be implemented by or in partnership with one or more of the following entities:

- (a) Community colleges (as defined in the NIA)
- (b) Historically Black colleges and universities (as defined in the NIA)
- (c) Tribal Colleges and Universities (as defined in the NIA)
- (d) Minority-serving institutions (as defined in the NIA)

Strengths:

The proposal clearly states that University of Illinois-Chicago (UIC) will partner with WestEd for this project (p. e11). UIC will serve as an evaluation partner and provide additional support.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 3

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 2

1. Competitive Preference Priority 2:

Addressing the Impact of COVID-19 on Students, Educators, and Faculty: Community Asset-Mapping and Needs Assessment and Evidence-Based Instructional Approaches and Supports (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 and the educators who serve them through 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; and

(b) Using evidence-based instructional approaches and supports, such as professional development, coaching, ongoing support for educators, high-quality tutoring, expanded access to rigorous coursework and content across K-12, and expanded learning time to accelerate learning for students in ways that ensure all students have the opportunity to successfully meet challenging academic content standards without contributing to tracking or remedial courses.

Strengths:

The application states and cites how all students were impacted by the pandemic “but particularly students in underserved communities...” (p. e12). This project plans to utilize ongoing support for educators and coaching to meet the needs of students affected by COVID-19.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not clearly address sub-criterion A.

Reader's Score: **2**

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/02/2024 08:16 PM