

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/10/2024 02:57 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Oakland Natives Give Back Fund, Inc. (S411C240377)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	20	19
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	30	29
<b>Quality of Project Personnel</b>		
1. Project Personnel	10	7
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	10	5
<b>Sub Total</b>	70	60
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
1. Promoting Equity	3	3
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
1. Impact of COVID-19	3	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	6	3
<b>Total</b>	76	63

# Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - Early Tier 1 - 1: 84.411C

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

Applicant: Oakland Natives Give Back Fund, Inc. (S411C240377)

## 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 factor:

Reader's Score: 19

#### Sub

1. (1) The extent to which the proposed project involves the development or demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies. (20 points)

#### Strengths:

Oakland Natives Give Back, Inc. (ONGB) is in partnership with the California Department of Education (CDE) STEM Discovery Program, Oakland Unified School District (OUSD), Lighthouse Community Public Schools, San Mateo County Office of Education, Cal State East Bay (a Minority-Serving Institution), College of Alameda (a Minority-Serving Institution), East Oakland Youth Development Center, and RepresentEd (e20).

The applicant had implemented the Achievement Influencer Program (AIP) successfully to reduce absentees so the proposed grant will build on the demonstration of promising new strategies in creating a supportive and engaging learning environment through culturally responsive facilitation, advisory/career mentorship, college readiness, STEM exposure, and entrepreneurship and leadership skill development (e20).

The applicant provided data on chronic absenteeism at 29.7% of the student population during the 2021-22 school year, which is a sharp increase from pre-pandemic levels of 16% in 2019 (e21), a significant barrier to success, especially for students of color, impacting the likelihood of dropping out, higher rates of unemployment and poverty, diminished health outcomes, and increased criminal justice involvement (e21) to demonstrate the significance of this proposed project.

The OUSD has a critical need for targeted interventions to combat chronic absenteeism, with a rate of 61.4% among the highest in the state, disproportionately impacting African American and Latino students (e22).

OUSD's request for assistance provided the impetus for the initial AIP project with a cohort model that extended through the school year, with an emphasis on culturally responsive teaching and mentoring using mentors from similar backgrounds, helping students navigate academic challenges, and build confidence in abilities with three tiers of intervention as per Attendance Works (e24).

Current practices to address chronic absenteeism involve a multi-tiered approach that includes creating safe and inclusive school environments, engaging families, and implementing early warning systems using data-driven methods to identify at-risk students and provide targeted interventions such as mentoring programs and behavioral incentives (e23).

**Sub**

By embedding these three tiers of intervention, AIP effectively addressed different levels of absenteeism, ensuring comprehensive support for all students (e25) with student attendance increasing by 14.5 percentage points, a substantial improvement of 21.5% (e25). The real-time feedback loop allowed for the adaptation of strategies to maximize their effectiveness with data use measuring the program's impact.

At the end of the 2023-24 school year, ONGB was approached by CDE to support the Superintendent's STEM Discovery Program rollout. ONGB developed partnerships with the College of Alameda Math Engineering and Science Achievement (MESA) program and Cal State East Bay to support the college readiness/campus immersion and STEM exposure components with East Oakland Youth Development Center to focus on workforce development and with RepresentEd, which brings the design thinking/entrepreneurship component, all key elements that were missing from the original AIP design (e26). The significance of the project is demonstrated by the development of promising new strategies that build on the existing strategies.

ONGB's existing partner OUSD, launched a summer intensive pilot with 50 students who had attendance rates ranging from 94% to 63%. The summer intensive included college prep, college immersion, design thinking, workforce development, and STEM exposure. The goal is to learn from the current pilot and build upon and strengthen the success foundation of AIP(e27).

**Weaknesses:**

The goals listed on the bottom of page e37 do not match the goal chart starting on page e38.

The applicant did not provide sufficient information on scaling the project except to identify sustainability planning (e48) in year 4.

**Reader's Score: 19**

**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: 29**

**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. (10 points)**

**Strengths:**

The applicant stated that AIP 2.0 is grounded in the Theory of Change framework (e94), providing a structured approach to understanding and addressing the root causes of chronic absenteeism using much of the research and effective interventions suggested by Attendance Works (e28).

The evaluation plan is centered on the conceptual framework that articulates the key components of the AIP, mediators, and expected outcomes, drawing on established theories of change in educational interventions (e58). The primary components of the AIP include structured work-based learning experiences, mentorship, career readiness training, and social-emotional learning (SEL) components which are grounded in research on effective practices for enhancing student engagement and achievement, particularly for underrepresented students in STEM

**Sub**

fields The evaluation will measure key mediators, including the quality of instructional practices, student engagement in STEM activities, and the support provided by mentors. These mediators are hypothesized to influence the primary outcomes of interest: attendance, academic achievement, and career readiness (e58).

AIP 2.0 provides a multi-year approach for grades 9 to 12 in overcoming educational challenges by beginning with a summer intensive (240 hours) for 9th graders that includes college readiness courses, hands-on STEM projects, and workforce development training (e31) as the focus on work-based learning and community projects develop. The sophomore year provides dual enrollment opportunities at Alameda College, with the goal of earning an Associate's degree by the time they graduate from high school while integrating social-emotional learning (SEL), mentorship, and career readiness training into the curriculum.

The project integrates STEM exposure, entrepreneurship, and leadership development into a cohesive program to create an engaging and supportive learning environment tailored to unique needs of high-need students by addressing the immediate challenges of absenteeism and academic disengagement but also lays a strong foundation for long-term success in STEM careers (e34-35).

**Weaknesses:**

There were no weaknesses observed.

**Reader's Score: 10**

**2. (2) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable. (5 points)**

**Strengths:**

The applicant listed the three (3) goals in Table 1 with the objectives, outcomes with metrics/measures, and timelines (e38-40) for the project which are clearly specified and measurable such as at least 90% of students will cut their absences by 50%.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant identified four (4) goals on e37 but Table 1 lists 3 goals. Within Table 1, Goals 3 and 4 as listed on the previous page as (3) expose AIs to college and career pathways in STEM and (4) increase college readiness through workshops and dual enrollment programs as a strategy to recover credits and/or close equity and achievement gaps and prepare students for college and high-demand careers in STEM fields. However, on Table 1, the third goal is listed as Improve awareness of STEM pathways and college readiness in summer bridge which combines goal 3 and 4 but leaves out some specific activities on dual enrollment and credit recovery.

**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. (15 points)**

**Strengths:**

The applicant defined high-need as students of color, students from low-income families, and English Language Learners (ELLs) (e26).

To recruit high-need students, the recruitment process involves program alumni presenting at Student Information Sessions and Student/Parent Orientations, soliciting recommendations from school personnel, and utilizing monthly district data provided through the OUSD partnership. Partnering with local community colleges such as Alameda

**Sub**

College to facilitate the dual enrollment component of the program will ensure students have access to rigorous academic opportunities and support (e36-37).

High-needs students often face systemic barriers that contribute to chronic absenteeism, including poverty, lack of transportation, and limited access to supportive educational resources. By targeting these students with robust STEM education programs, the aim is to level the playing field and provide skills and knowledge necessary to pursue careers in fields where they are significantly underrepresented.

The Achievement Influencer Program (AIP 2.0.) aims to leverage the power of STEM education to address chronic absenteeism and foster a love for learning among students of color in Oakland, potentially helping to close the representation gap in STEM fields. By providing students with engaging, hands-on STEM experiences and fostering a supportive learning environment, AIP seeks to inspire students to attend school regularly and pursue their academic and career goals in STEM. The proposed project not only aims to expand diversity in the STEM workforce, but also to positively impact students' potential earnings, health outcomes, and overall quality of life(e27).

AIP program not only addresses the immediate issue of chronic absenteeism but also contributes to the broader goal of diversifying the STEM workforce (e28).

**Weaknesses:**

There were no weaknesses observed.

**Reader's Score: 15**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel**

- 1. The Secretary considers the quality of the personnel who will carry out the proposed project. In determining the quality of project personnel, the Secretary considers the following factor:**

**Reader's Score: 7**

**Sub**

- 1. (1) 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, the Secretary considers the qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel. (10 points)**

**Strengths:**

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 (e111) and demonstrates its commitment with the current personnel complement.

The applicant identified the key personnel within ONGB by title and responsibilities on pages e40-42. The partner agencies and their roles were listed on pages e42-46 with specific responsibilities.

Appropriate qualifications and training are evident in the review of the ONGB key personnel.

**Sub**

chart (e41) with a short summary of relevant experience.

**Weaknesses:**

The partner agencies did not have any key personnel identified for particular functions so the qualifications and relevant training were not reviewed.

There were a number of resumes listed (e75-90) which were not identified as key personnel in the proposed grant so it is not possible to comment on the relevant training for the position.

The resumes of the evaluation team were not provided so it is not possible to comment on relevant qualifications.

**Reader's Score: 7**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan**

- 1. The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the adequacy of resources and quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

**Reader's Score: 5**

**Sub**

- 1. (1) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant listed the roles and responsibilities of each organization beginning on pages e43-47 followed by the timelines and milestones listing by year beginning on e47-50 with specific activities to take place during that period. A dissemination plan was listed on pages e50-51 followed by the evaluation plan.

The plan provided specific activities for each partner organization.

Callea LLC was identified as the external independent evaluation team (e43) with clearly defined responsibilities.

**Weaknesses:**

The management plan did not provide the specificity for monitoring project tasks since it was listed by organization, not specific key personnel.

The evaluation team members were not identified in the personnel section or budget so it is not clear if those tasks will be completed on time and within budget.

There were several positions identified in the budget without discussion of a hiring plan or if they are current employees of the organizations, such as the positions of (e97-98) Operations Manager 1.0 FTE, Achievement

**Sub**

Coordinator-East Bay 1.0FTE, South Bay 1.0FTE, 1 Academic Advisor per school at .2FTE, Academic Liaison at .2FTE, and Academic Coaches at 50:1 for .2 FTE.

Consultants were listed at \$100,000 per year but it was not clear how they would be utilized (e99) other than a notation of evaluator and advanced data analysis and supplemental mental health support.

**Reader's Score: 5**

**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 is partnering with minority-serving institutions to develop leadership and college readiness skills through STEM courses to reduce economic barriers for targeted students.

**Weaknesses:**

There were no weaknesses observed.

**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 did not address Competitive Preference Priority 2.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant did not address Competitive Preference Priority 2.

**Reader's Score: 0**

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 09/10/2024 02:57 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/10/2024 04:55 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Oakland Natives Give Back Fund, Inc. (S411C240377)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	20	18
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	30	29
<b>Quality of Project Personnel</b>		
1. Project Personnel	10	7
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	10	7
<b>Sub Total</b>	70	61
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
1. Promoting Equity	3	2
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
1. Impact of COVID-19	3	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	6	2
<b>Total</b>	76	63

# Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - Early Tier 1 - 1: 84.411C

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

Applicant: Oakland Natives Give Back Fund, Inc. (S411C240377)

## 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 factor:

Reader's Score: 18

#### Sub

1. (1) The extent to which the proposed project involves the development or demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies. (20 points)

#### Strengths:

The Achievement Influencer Program (AIP), AIP 2.0 aims to reduce chronic absenteeism through a variety of supports which include mentoring, college readiness support, STEM exposure, and entrepreneur and leadership development. This proposal does a thorough job of presenting foundational data and research to support the rationale and need for the project which includes connecting chronic absenteeism to outcomes related to student performance, graduation rates, mental health concerns, and disproportionate representation based on demographic background (pages e21-22). The current version of the AIP 2.0 program being proposed builds practices tied together from other programs (page e23), builds on a previously established program with integration of new elements described on page e26, and has conducted a pilot test of the new version with positive results (page e26). Attendance data from the prior program outcomes is shared and indicates initial positive results from one school year (page e25). Connection of the proposal to developing broader impacts and greater inclusion in the STEM workforce is also a strength which will support workforce diversity and improve student engagement in the interventions. The design of the program addresses "immediate challenges related to absenteeism while establishing a robust support system for long-term success" (page e31) is a strength.

#### Weaknesses:

Only one year of attendance data is presented to support prior program success and many other measures are identified throughout the proposal and evaluation plan but not included. Additional data points to establish prior program success are needed to determine the efficacy of scaling the program. Sustainability planning is identified in title only on page e48 and no specific information about proposed sustainability or scaling of the project is provided.

Reader's Score: 18

### 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: 29**

**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. (10 points)

**Strengths:**

The logic model presented on page e94 is well designed and shows how each element of the project is designed to lead to an output and outcomes. Also, the logic model is designed on evidence-based research which supports the approach to addressing the root causes of chronic absenteeism.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 10**

2. (2) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable. (5 points)

**Strengths:**

Table 1 on pages e36-40 identifies 3 key goals and related objectives, outcomes, and timelines. The goals are well aligned to the project rationale, the objectives are measurable and designed in a way to accomplish the goals.

**Weaknesses:**

Page e37 identifies a 4th goal which is listed as 3 to "expose Achievement Liaisons (ALs) to college and career pathways in STEM" which is not included or addressed in Table 1 on pages e38-40. No objectives, outcomes, or timelines are provided for this goal.

**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. (15 points)

**Strengths:**

Throughout the proposal, the team demonstrates a focus on serving students that they have defined as high needs (student from low income families, students of color, first-generation students, English language learners, students with disabilities, chronically absent students, students experiencing homelessness, and students with mental health challenge; page e9-10). Research is presented throughout the proposal to demonstrate the unique need for the project among the identified target population. Additionally, elements that include engaging parents and families in multiple ways as well as community partners provides embedded support for project success. Pages e35-e36 provide a specific breakdown of target subgroups for the AIP 2.0 program.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 15**

## Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the personnel who will carry out the proposed project. In determining the quality of project personnel, the Secretary considers the following factor:

Reader's Score: 7

### Sub

1. (1) 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, the Secretary considers the qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel. (10 points)

#### Strengths:

The project personnel presented on pages e40-e42 in Table C.1 appear to be experts in their fields with designated project roles that align with their prior educational and workforce expertise. Inclusion of leadership expertise build partnerships and manage the project, social work experience to evaluate interventions and conduct training, learning and instruction expertise to design blended learning solutions, program management, and evaluation cover many areas of the project design and objectives. Table C.2 on pages e42-43 demonstrates a robust and systemwide partnership that can impact many levels or layers of student attendance and academic performance. Letters of commitment are provided from the California Department of Education and from Oakland Unified School District.

#### Weaknesses:

No teachers or faculty from the community college partners or the high school partners are listed in the key personnel area. Engagement from Cal State East Bay and College of Alameda faculty are mentioned on page e44 but no one is identified as key personnel to ensure that the activities are being carried out. Letters of commitment are not provided from community college partners or other community partners mentioned in the proposal.

Reader's Score: 7

## Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the adequacy of resources and quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 7

### Sub

1. (1) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.

#### Strengths:

The description of the responsibilities and key project elements that each partner will contribute (pages e43-e46) provides a clear understanding of how the project will be developed and implemented. The inclusion of feedback loops and continuous improvement described on page e47 is a strength of the project. Project timeline and

**Sub**

milestones describing program setup through implementation are provided on pages e47-e50 and give an overall view of the project. Budgeted funds on pages e98-99 include wrap around services for students (support services, emergency family need, meals and snacks, bonus incentives, and transportation).

**Weaknesses:**

Project timeline and milestones (pages e47-e50) do not include personnel, groups, or organizations responsible for carrying out key activities. Budgeted funds on e98 are heavy on salaries and personnel have high percentages allocated. In the services and other expenditures section on e99 tuition for dual enrollment initiatives is not included. Also, large lines in the budget including consultants and travel need additional breakdown and explanation.

**Reader's Score: 7**

**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:**

Table C.2 on pages e42-43 identifies community college partners and on page e44 the specific tasks and responsibilities of Cal State East Bay and College of Alameda are identified.

**Weaknesses:**

No letters of commitment or support are provided from the community college partners and no funds are budgeted for community college support which includes personnel or tuition.

**Reader's Score: 2**

**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 proposal did not address Competitive Preference Priority 2 and it is not marked on page e9.

**Weaknesses:**

The proposal did not address Competitive Preference Priority 2 and it is not marked on page e9.

**Reader's Score:**      **0**

---

**Status:**              Submitted  
**Last Updated:**      09/10/2024 04:55 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/10/2024 08:31 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Oakland Natives Give Back Fund, Inc. (S411C240377)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	20	19
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	30	30
<b>Quality of Project Personnel</b>		
1. Project Personnel	10	7
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	10	8
<b>Sub Total</b>	70	64
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
1. Promoting Equity	3	3
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
1. Impact of COVID-19	3	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	6	3
<b>Total</b>	76	67



# Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - Early Tier 1 - 1: 84.411C

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

Applicant: Oakland Natives Give Back Fund, Inc. (S411C240377)

## 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 factor:

Reader's Score: 19

#### Sub

1. (1) The extent to which the proposed project involves the development or demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies. (20 points)

#### Strengths:

The applicant provided a proposed project that involves the development of new strategies that build on existing strategies. The significance of the project is described as multi-tiered approach to address attendance issues for students in several school districts in California. Starting on page e10, the applicant lists the proposed activities. These activities are a summer intensive program, work-based learning and mentorship, mental health services, college courses and credit, outreach and information sessions, and monitoring and evaluation of data collection.

#### Weaknesses:

The applicant did not provide a sustainability plan as to how the project will continue after the funding period ends.

Reader's Score: 19

### 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: 30

#### 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. (10 points)

#### Strengths:

The applicant provided a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities. Starting on page e28, the applicant provides a detailed explanation of AIP (Achievement Influencer Program). The

**Sub**

program aims to address the root causes of chronic absenteeism, identify the specific barriers and implement targeted interventions to overcome the challenges. The applicant gave details on strategies outlined by Attendance Works that include a multi-tiered approach with universal strategies, early intervention strategies and intensive support strategies.

**Weaknesses:**

None noted

**Reader's Score: 10**

**2. (2) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable. (5 points)**

**Strengths:**

The applicant provided the goals, objectives and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project that were clearly specified and measurable. On page e11, the applicant provided the summary of the five project objectives with their activities and expected outcomes. The project objectives listed were to increase daily attendance, enhance STEM engagement and academic performance, develop leadership and college readiness skills, support social-emotional development and build a supportive and inclusive learning environment.

**Weaknesses:**

None noted

**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. (15 points)**

**Strengths:**

The applicant provided the design of the proposed project that will successfully address the needs of the target population. Starting on page e35, the applicant provided details of the target population. The 500 students to be targeted over the four years of the program are from 9th to 12th grade classified under several subgroups. According to the applicant, 20% of the students will be English Language Learners, 30% are low-income students, 25% are African American, 15% are Latino and 10% are Native American and Pacific Islanders. On page e32, the applicant listed the activities that will be implemented to address the chronic absenteeism and barriers. The applicant will be providing STEM exposure with hands-on projects, workshops, and mentorship. They will provide entrepreneurship development through business incubation programs, start-up simulations and access to resources. They will also provide leadership skill development through workshops, community service projects, and leadership roles. To address the needs of high need students, the applicant will provide culturally relevant curriculum, inclusive staffing, and language, financial and holistic support.

**Weaknesses:**

None noted

**Reader's Score: 15**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel**

**1. The Secretary considers the quality of the personnel who will carry out the proposed project. In determining the quality of project personnel, the Secretary considers the following factor:**

Reader's Score: 7

Sub

1. (1) **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, the Secretary considers the qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel. (10 points)**

**Strengths:**

The applicant provided the qualifications, relevant training and experience of key personnel. Starting on page e40, the applicant provided a chart with the key personnel and partners. Each key personnel was identified with their role, project responsibilities and credentials. Additionally, the applicant provided the resumes for all key personnel starting on page e69.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant did not provide a statement on how they encourage applications for employment from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented. The applicant did not provide information on the key personnel from the partners in the project. The applicant did not provide the resumes of the evaluation team members.

Reader's Score: 7

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan**

1. **The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the adequacy of resources and quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

Reader's Score: 8

Sub

1. (1) **The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant provided a management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget that had clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks. Starting on page e43, the applicant stated that the plan would be used to effectively address chronic absenteeism in underserved communities through their STEM-focused educational framework. The applicant provided a breakdown of all teams working on the project with their responsibilities and roles. For example, the project leadership is responsible for the planning, coordination, and execution of all program activities. The technical support and continuous improvement team will be providing goal setting, aligning instructional objectives, selecting courses, providing professional development, and recruiting students. Additionally, the applicant provided the project timeline and milestones for each of the years of the project starting on page e47. For example, for year one the focus will be on the initial setup, recruitment and training and pilot testing. Activities listed were to establish partnerships, develop the curriculum, begin recruitment of students, train the advisors and coordinators and

**Sub**

implement pilot testing.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant listed consultants but did not provide information as to their roles and responsibilities. The applicant did not provide any information on how the dual enrollment would function or who would incur the cost of the classes.

**Reader's Score: 8**

**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 demonstrated how the project will be implemented in partnership with community colleges and minority-serving institutions. On pages e11 and e15, the applicant states that the partnership for the project will include providing dual enrollment classes at Cal State East Bay and College of Alameda. The applicant will also provide a description of the summer intensive program to be held at both of the colleges as stated on page e10.

**Weaknesses:**

None noted

**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:**

Applicant did not address this criterion.

**Weaknesses:**

Applicant did not address this criterion.

**Reader's Score:**     **0**

---

**Status:**           Submitted

**Last Updated:**   09/10/2024 08:31 PM

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 10/03/2024 02:58 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Oakland Natives Give Back Fund, Inc. (S411C240377)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	30	28
<b>Sub Total</b>	30	28
<b>Total</b>	30	28

# Technical Review Form

Panel #17 - Early Tier 2 - 18: 84.411C

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

Applicant: Oakland Natives Give Back Fund, Inc. (S411C240377)

## Questions

### 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: 28

#### 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 with or without reservations as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbook (as defined in this notice). (20 points)

#### Strengths:

- 1) The plan proposes a quasi-experimental design (QED) with propensity score matching to ensure baseline equivalence, meeting the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) standards with reservations (e52).
- 2) The plan addresses internal validity threats by minimizing contamination between treatment and control groups (e52).
- 3) Longitudinal data collection, with baseline and annual follow ups, allows for short- and long-term analysis, enhancing the ability to measure the durability of the intervention's impact (e54).
- 4) Sensitivity analyses are included to address potential unobserved confounders, boosting the reliability of the findings (e56).

#### Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 20

2. (2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes. (5 points)

#### Strengths:

- 1) Monthly reports will provide continuous feedback on implementation and effectiveness, allowing for program adjustments as necessary (e57).
- 2) The use of multi-method data collection (surveys, interviews, focus groups) ensures comprehensive coverage of implementation and impact (e59).
- 3) Ongoing formative assessments allow for real-time identification of challenges and facilitate continuous improvement (e58).



Sub

**Weaknesses:**

None noted.

**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. (5 points)

**Strengths:**

- 1) The logic model (e94) adequately describes key components (i.e., mentorship, STEM activities, SEL training), mediators (engagement, instructional practices), and outcomes (attendance, GPA, college readiness) (e. 58 and e. 59).
- 2) The evaluation emphasizes equity and intersectionality, disaggregating data by demographic factors such as race, gender, and socioeconomic status, which is critical for understanding differential impacts (e52).

**Weaknesses:**

- 1) The evaluation plan does not define some mediators, such as "quality of instructional practices," which are vague and should be more specific, with clearer operationalization to ensure consistent measurement across sites.
- 2) The evaluation plan has details, but not finalized, measurable thresholds for implementation.

**Reader's Score: 3**

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 10/03/2024 02:58 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 10/07/2024 12:28 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Oakland Natives Give Back Fund, Inc. (S411C240377)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	30	29
<b>Sub Total</b>	30	29
<b>Total</b>	30	29

# Technical Review Form

Panel #17 - Early Tier 2 - 18: 84.411C

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

Applicant: Oakland Natives Give Back Fund, Inc. (S411C240377)

## Questions

### 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: 29

#### 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 with or without reservations as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbook (as defined in this notice). (20 points)

#### Strengths:

The applicant proposes a clearly defined quasi-experimental design using propensity score matching to evaluate the effectiveness of Achievement Influencer Program (AIP) 2.0 on student attendance, GPA, standardized test scores, participation in STEM activities, SAT/ACT scores, college application rates, and student's interest in STEM careers (e54). The applicant specifically includes multiple outcome measures and data sources for measuring impacts in similar outcome domains to triangulate findings and provide robust evidence of program effectiveness (e57). The application proposes strategies to address baseline equivalence, and to avoid spillover/contamination effects (e52). The proposed evaluation methods will produce evidence that will meet What Works Clearinghouse Group Design Standards with Reservations.

#### Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 20

2. (2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes. (5 points)

#### Strengths:

The research design includes a well-described multi-method approach to gathering performance data, both quantitatively and qualitatively to track progress and allow for periodic assessment (e57). The longitudinal nature of the applicant's research design also allows for the collection of both immediate and sustained measures of the outcomes (e56), which should allow for early preliminary findings on progress towards achieving the outcome.

#### Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Sub

**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. (5 points)

**Strengths:**

The applicant's proposal clearly articulates the key project components (structured work-based learning experiences, mentorship, career readiness training, social-emotional learning), as well as the mediators (the quality of instructional practices, student engagement in STEM activities, mentor support) and the outcomes (attendance, academic achievement, and career readiness) in their narrative (e58 and e59).

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant hasn't finalized their thresholds for acceptable implementation.

**Reader's Score: 4**

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 10/07/2024 12:28 PM