

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/29/2022 10:14 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Fugees Family (S411C220154)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	20	20
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	30
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Project Personnel	10	10
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	10	8
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	30	0
Sub Total	100	68
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. Promoting Equity	3	3
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
1. COVID-19	3	3
Sub Total	6	6
Total	106	74

Technical Review Form

Panel #17 - EIR Early Phase - 17: 84.411C

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Fugees Family (S411C220154)

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:

Reader's Score: 20

Sub

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 an extensive discussion of the significance of the proposed project that “builds upon the innovation of the existing Fugees Family schools and the evidence base of proven instructional practices while providing alternatives to the historical strategies used in schools nationwide to address the needs of English language learners” (e19).

The applicant stated that the project is significant because it addresses the challenges of current educational practices for refugee English language learners (ELL), which include the segregation of students from content area classes to focus on learning English. This often negatively impacts content area achievement as students miss the instruction that occurs while separated from the classroom: “The historical practice of pulling students from content classes to focus on language then sending them back to their content classrooms limits learning” (e20).

The applicant provided documentation of the success of the proposed Teranga Academy model, which is a competency based culturally responsive immersion model where students move through the levels based upon their academic achievement, while building social-emotional skills. Upon completion of the prescribed competencies in each of the three levels, they then move to traditional middle and high schools where the success rate for Fugees students is “92% high school graduation rate compared to the non-ELL national average of 86% and the ELL rate of just 67% and a 100% college acceptance rate” (e20).

Weaknesses:

No Weaknesses Noted.

Reader's Score: 20

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 comprehensive description of the conceptual framework for Tenaga Academy, the proposed project, built upon the overall goal of the agency: "to disrupt refugee and ELL education as it currently exists" (e29). Traditional programming for refugee children often includes separation from the daily school schedule, where for one/two periods per day, students receive instruction to overcome academic and language challenges in a separate classroom. Too often, students miss essential content instruction accompanied by the stigma from being publicly removed from the classroom. The proposed project model is a "language immersion in a newcomer-only (small group) environment where identity and culture are celebrated daily" (e27). In the Tenaga Academy model, students receive full-day instruction in smaller culturally responsive environments which support academic achievement via "competency-based (leveled) learning; daily music, art, and sports as instructional tools, and family and community engagement" (e26).

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:

The applicant provided a clearly defined process that was the foundation of the development of the goals and objectives, which will facilitate the successful achievement of the project outcomes. Included in this process was the alignment of the "objectives and outcomes to three clear impact areas: students, teachers, and implementation" (e28) inclusive of the measurement strategies, "the specific measurements which include quantitative and qualitative tools" (e28) that will monitor the project's progress and success.

As an example of the detailed and measurable goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project, the applicant provided the following information in Table 1 (e29-e30): "Goal 1-Student Success; Measure-We will see improvements in the following key indicators of student learning; Obj.1.2-Increases in student attendance as an indicator of socio-emotional learning-Spring 2025 baseline, spring 2026 outcome; Analysis-The evaluation will also consider to what extent teacher knowledge, teacher skills, and implementation fidelity relate to student outcomes" (e29).

Weaknesses:

No Weaknesses 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)**

Sub

Strengths:

The target population for the Teranga Academy proposed project are middle and high school refugee students. The applicant described the students as English language learners with challenges in levels of academic performance who possess trauma-related stress based on violence or other situations (i.e., “extreme poverty”) (e31) in their home countries, and who have housing insecurities as many of them have never actually lived in a home. To successfully meet these needs, the applicant provided a detailed description of the implementation strategies in Table 4 (e35) to meet the academic and social and emotional needs of the students. These include “sheltered, small class size, Competency-based (instruction), trained teachers, community liaison ongoing professional learning, Celebrating identity, and Soft-landing space” (e35).

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:**

Reader's Score: 10

Sub

- 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:

To honor the integrity of its founding beliefs, the Fugees Family purposely seeks out team members who reflect the diversity of the communities they serve and provided specific statistical documentation to support the diversity of its staff: “79.5%-persons of color; 38.5%-foreign-born; 64% women 56%-spent one or more years living abroad; and half of Board members are black, indigenous, and people of color (BIPOC)” (e38).

The diversity of the project team is also reflected in the key project personnel, highlighted by their expert qualifications. For example, the Project Director, Emily Futransky, the Chief Impact Officer of Fugees Family, is the “granddaughter of a Holocaust survivor” (e39) who also brings to the project excellent and relevant qualifications to serve as the project director. Ms. Futransky “founded the Upper School at the Mary McDowell Friends School in Brooklyn, New York” (e39), and has a “Masters of Education in General and Special Education from Bank Street College of Education” (e39, Appendix B: Resumes of Key Personnel-e53). In addition, Ms. Futransky “led the team of Teranga Coaches as Bowling Green teachers and leaders prepared for opening day” (e39).

Weaknesses:

No Weaknesses Noted!

Sub

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

- 1. The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan, the Secretary considers:**

Reader's Score: 8

Sub

- 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. (10 points)**

Strengths:

The applicant provided a detailed Management Plan that supported the ability of the proposed project, Project Teranga, to successfully achieve its project goals and objectives. The plan will address the challenges of replicating the core components of Teranga Academy models throughout the nation through a “robust and iterative evaluation of the replication and implementation processes” (e40). The plan included an 18-month timeline, milestones, and responsibilities of project partners to successfully facilitate project implementation. In Phase 2: Design & Plan (of the 4-phase plan), the applicant stated: “coaches from Fugees Families will meet with school district personnel on a regular monthly school to plan implementation strategies for the school year” (e42). The team members who will be involved in the Design and Plan phase of the plan include Fugees Families coaches, and district teachers.

Weaknesses:

Although a Management Plan was included, the lack of specificity impacted understanding how the applicant would successfully monitor the progress and completion of the project milestones (e42).

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

Strengths:

Sub

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

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:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

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:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1

1. Competitive Preference Priority 1:

Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities (up to 3 points).

Projects designed to promote educational equity and adequacy in resources and opportunity for underserved students in middle school or high school that examine the sources of inequity and inadequacy and implement responses, including rigorous, engaging, and well-rounded (e.g., that include music and the arts) approaches to learning that are inclusive with regard to race, ethnicity, culture, language, and disability status and prepare students for college, career, and civic life, including one or more of the following:

- (a) Student-centered learning models that may leverage technology to address learner variability (e.g., universal design for learning (as defined in this notice), K–12 competency-based education (as defined in this notice), project-based learning, or hybrid/blended learning) and provide high-quality learning content, applications, or tools.
- (b) Middle school courses or projects that prepare students to participate in advanced coursework in high school.
- (c) Advanced courses and programs, including dual enrollment and early college programs.
- (d) Project-based and experiential learning, including service and work-based learning.
- (e) High-quality career and technical education courses, pathways, and industry-recognized credentials that are integrated into the curriculum.

Strengths:

Teranga Academy is “designed to disrupt refugee and ELL education as it currently exists” (e29). Because many of the student refugee target populations enter the United States with no knowledge of the English language, there are questions about their age, their former grade placement, or level of academic performance. Therefore, the applicant proposes a student-centered learning model (competency-based instruction) with “leveled transition bands rather than grades” (e34). Students progress through the levels (rather than traditional grades-1st, 2nd etc.) based upon their competency in both content and progress in speaking and understanding the English language as measured by their proficiency of identified criterion (e34-e35).

Weaknesses:

No Weaknesses 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 (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:

(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 provided a description of strategies to be implemented to address the impact of Covid-19 on students, educators and faculty and indicated that the effects of the pandemic (i.e., “school closures,” e36) were magnified for refugee children who often have just arrived in the United States. To address the effects Covid-19, the applicant will conduct needs assessments and asset mapping of the project partners, which is a “best practice of Fugees Family” (e37). In addition, the applicant stated that they will also provide training for instructional staff and administration to enhance their knowledge and implementation of such strategies as “competency-based instruction” (e37) to meet the unique needs of refugee children.

Weaknesses:

No Weaknesses Noted.

Reader's Score: 3

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/29/2022 10:14 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/26/2022 01:56 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Fugees Family (S411C220154)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	20	20
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	30
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Project Personnel	10	8
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	10	10
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	30	0
Sub Total	100	68
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. Promoting Equity	3	3
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
1. COVID-19	3	3
Sub Total	6	6
Total	106	74

Technical Review Form

Panel #17 - EIR Early Phase - 17: 84.411C

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Fugees Family (S411C220154)

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:

Reader's Score: 20

Sub

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 proposed project involves the development of promising new strategies that build on providing alternatives to the historical strategies used in schools nationwide to address the needs of English language learners (ELL) (pp. e19-e20). The applicant cited research regarding the historical practice of pulling students from content classes to focus on language and then back to their general classrooms limits academic learning (p. e20). Furthermore, schools are uniquely underprepared to serve these students (p. e21). State and federal legislation hold schools and districts accountable for the language and academic performance of ELLs, such as refugees (p. e22). The proposed project intends to address these issues in a holistic and intensive approach to accelerate students' learning through the celebration of identity and culture, holistic English language acquisition and a trauma-informed approach to schooling, and comprehensive support of families.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted

Reader's Score: 20

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)

Sub

Strengths:

The conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities is based on three pillars (i.e., redesigning existing public schools, retraining teachers in cultural competencies and instructional methods, and realigning policy to allow different ways of learning in existing schools) (p. e 26). The Project Terranga Logic Model (Appendix G, p. e77) contains inputs (i.e., Fugees Family Staff), our approach (i.e., Teranga Academy – Re-imagining school for ELL students by replicating and iteratively refining the established Fugees Family model via partnerships with public school districts nationally.), project output (i.e., Teranga Academy Students – Sheltered, English immersion classrooms with culturally competent content teachers), and student outcomes (i.e., Increase in the number of ELL students achieving English language proficiency (reading, writing, speaking, listening) (p. e77).

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:

The goals (i.e., Goal 2: Teacher self-efficacy), objectives (Obj. 2.1: Improved teacher self-efficacy, pedagogical content knowledge, and attitudes toward teaching ELLs), and outcomes (i.e., Increase in the number of ELL students achieving English Language Arts and math proficiency (p. e77)) to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable and outlined in Table 1 (pp. e29-e30). The proposed project's overall goal is to disrupt refugee and ELL education as it currently exists (p. e29).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses 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 design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population based on the sheltered, small class size, competency-based learning, trained teachers and ongoing teacher development, and athletics, music, and art as tools for learning and healing (p. e34).

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:

Reader's Score: 8

Sub

- 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, and gender. The applicant states that it seeks out teachers and leaders reflecting the community they serve, i.e., 79.5% identify as a person of color, 38.5% are foreign-born, and 64% are women. Furthermore, more than half of the board members identify as Black, indigenous, and people of color (pp. e37-e38).

The applicant provides the qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel (project director, instructional designer, coaches, and project manager). The CEO of the organization will allocate 10% of her full-time equivalent to the proposed project by providing the ongoing vision and oversight (p. e39).

Weaknesses:

The omission of specific details regarding the project manager's responsibilities impact understanding of the key project personnel's role in the proposed project (p. e40).

Reader's Score: 8

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

- 1. The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan, the Secretary considers:**

Reader's Score: 10

Sub

- 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. (10 points)**

Strengths:

The management plan should achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, which includes clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks (Table 5, p. e42). For example, the CEO and Impact Director would be responsible for recruitment (i.e., Research and target school districts with significant numbers of newcomers in regions with established refugee centers.) throughout the summer and fall of year 1. The milestone during this period is that 40 school districts would be identified, while 25 school districts would express interest (p. e42).

Sub

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted

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

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

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:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

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:

Weaknesses:

Sub

Reader's Score:

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1

1. Competitive Preference Priority 1:

Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities (up to 3 points).

Projects designed to promote educational equity and adequacy in resources and opportunity for underserved students in middle school or high school that examine the sources of inequity and inadequacy and implement responses, including rigorous, engaging, and well-rounded (e.g., that include music and the arts) approaches to learning that are inclusive with regard to race, ethnicity, culture, language, and disability status and prepare students for college, career, and civic life, including one or more of the following:

- (a) Student-centered learning models that may leverage technology to address learner variability (e.g., universal design for learning (as defined in this notice), K–12 competency-based education (as defined in this notice), project-based learning, or hybrid/blended learning) and provide high-quality learning content, applications, or tools.
- (b) Middle school courses or projects that prepare students to participate in advanced coursework in high school.
- (c) Advanced courses and programs, including dual enrollment and early college programs.
- (d) Project-based and experiential learning, including service and work-based learning.
- (e) High-quality career and technical education courses, pathways, and industry-recognized credentials that are integrated into the curriculum.

Strengths:

The project is designed to promote educational equity and adequacy in resources and opportunities for underserved refugee students in middle and high school. The proposed project implements competency-based instruction with leveled transition bands rather than grades (p. e34). Students demonstrate their learning related to required concepts and benchmarks.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses 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 (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:

- (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 plans to conduct a needs assessment during the implementation or individual site plan development (p. e36). During the needs assessment, school districts would identify which students would be targeted in the first year. Each site would also complete asset mapping of partners during year 1 on needed partnerships for refugee families (p. e37).

The proposed project includes evidence-based approaches and support, such as professional development for teachers and leaders and competency-based instruction in a sheltered classroom setting, and English language immersion (p. e37).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted

Reader's Score: 3

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/26/2022 01:56 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/29/2022 09:56 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Fugees Family (S411C220154)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	20	20
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	29
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Project Personnel	10	10
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	10	7
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	30	0
Sub Total	100	66
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. Promoting Equity	3	3
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
1. COVID-19	3	3
Sub Total	6	6
Total	106	72

Technical Review Form

Panel #17 - EIR Early Phase - 17: 84.411C

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Fugees Family (S411C220154)

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:

Reader's Score: 20

Sub

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 proposed program intends to serve 2,000 students, grades 6-12, with a focus on ELL/newcomers. The proposed program is based on Fugees Academy's prior work, with the expansion into public middle and high schools (e20). Early work with the Fugees Academy shows progress in achievement, graduation rates, and college acceptance rate (e19). The proposed program, the Teranga Academy, is based on research in ELL. The applicant discusses common practices and shortcomings in ELL instruction and why the proposed approach is likely to be successful. The applicant provides a clear rationale for their proposed program based on research and prior experience (e19-e24).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 20

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)

Sub

Strengths:

The proposal provides a framework, integrating a 3-pillar structure (redesigning public schools, retraining teachers, and realigning policy) with a 3-tiered instructional support system for students (level 1: 3rd grade benchmark; level 2: 6th grade benchmark; level 3: 8/9th grade benchmarks). Together with the research provided, there is a clear framework for the proposed project (e25-28).

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:

The objectives are clear and measurable. The applicant provides appropriate measures to monitor progress, including timelines for measures (e28-30). The logic model provides benchmarks to measure the expected outcomes (e77). The Implementation Fidelity table provides a list of activities and measures to monitor progress toward goals (e85).

Weaknesses:

The goals are not clearly articulated. For example, Goal 1 is "Student success" (e29-30). Without clearly stated goals, it may be difficult to measure progress toward goals.

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 provides detailed justification for the approach and promise of the project design. The program targets English Language Learners (ELLs) and provides an intensive, innovative alternative to traditional ELL instruction in public schools (e30-32).

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:

Reader's Score: 10

Sub

Sub

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 provides relevant data regarding current staffing to demonstrate success in attracting employees from underrepresented groups (e37-e38). The key personnel, including the project director and the CEO, have experience and educational backgrounds that provide a strong foundation for the proposed work. The program is seeking to hire an important role, the Impact Director (job description provided) (e39-e40, e56-e66).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. **The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan, the Secretary considers:**

Reader's Score: 7

Sub

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. (10 points)**

Strengths:

The budget narrative describes expenses and justification that support project goals (e89-e97). The applicant provides a timeline that indicates major phases of the project, responsibilities, and milestones (e42). The management plan provides sufficient detail for accomplishing program tasks.

Weaknesses:

There is a second timeline that provides different information from the first (e42, e86). The performance measures do not provide quantitative data targets (e101-105). These factors may impact the ability to monitor progress toward goals.

Reader's Score: 7

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

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

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:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

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:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1

1. Competitive Preference Priority 1:

Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities (up to 3 points).

Projects designed to promote educational equity and adequacy in resources and opportunity for underserved students in middle school or high school that examine the sources of inequity and inadequacy and implement responses, including rigorous, engaging, and well-rounded (e.g., that include music and the arts) approaches to learning that are inclusive with regard to race, ethnicity, culture, language, and disability status and prepare students for college, career, and civic life, including one or more of the following:

(a) Student-centered learning models that may leverage technology to address learner variability (e.g., universal design for learning (as defined in this notice), K–12 competency-based education (as defined in this notice), project-based learning, or hybrid/blended learning) and provide high-quality learning content, applications, or tools.

(b) Middle school courses or projects that prepare students to participate in advanced coursework in high school.

(c) Advanced courses and programs, including dual enrollment and early college programs.

(d) Project-based and experiential learning, including service and work-based learning.

(e) High-quality career and technical education courses, pathways, and industry-recognized credentials that are integrated into the curriculum.

Strengths:

The proposed program addresses the needs of an underserved population: ELLs and specifically recent immigrants and refugees. The program is designed to offer a student-centered learning model that is inclusive and engaging, utilizing competency-based education (e34-e36).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses 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 (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:

(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 proposed program addresses the unique challenges of the COVID-19 pandemic on newcomers. The applicant offers a plan to conduct a needs assessment and asset mapping. The plan includes evidence-based instructional approaches and ongoing support for educators (e36-e37).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 3

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/29/2022 09:56 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 10/11/2022 02:40 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Fugees Family (S411C220154)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	30	27
Total	30	27

Technical Review Form

Panel #7 - EIR Tier 2 - 3: 84.411C

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Fugees Family (S411C220154)

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: 27

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 has identified an independent external evaluator who will conduct the implementation and impact studies of student enrollment (p. e43). The independence of the impact evaluation ensures that all aspects of the evaluation will be unbiased and objective and is a separate activity from Project Teranga academies.

The identified student-level measures are appropriate and aligned and meet the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) standards (p. e45). The effort to align the assessment scores across states strengthens the evaluation's ability to produce evidence about the project's effectiveness.

The proposed quasi-experimental design (QED) using a two-stage propensity score matching technique is highly appropriate and it should result in equivalent groups which would meet the WWC standards at this level (p. e46). In addition, matching at the school level using state administrative records and matching at the student level ensures robust and balanced treatment and comparison groups (p. e47).

The evaluation adequately describes procedures to assess baseline equivalence and includes addressing the WWC thresholds (p. e47).

The proposed analysis using hierarchical linear modeling (HLM) is appropriate given the nested and clustering of students within school sites (p. e47).

The evaluation design, particular in measuring social-emotional learning outcomes using two confirmatory measures (attendance and survey) will provide a comprehensive understanding of the impact of the academy. This data will contribute evidence of the project's effectiveness that would meet the WWC standards.

Weaknesses:

The impact evaluation includes measuring teacher pedagogical content knowledge and attitudes toward teaching ELLs and students' ratings of their teachers who received Teranga Academy supports to effectively and

Sub

appropriately teach academy students. These measures may not be sufficient to provide objective data particular to the supports and its effect on teacher practice.

The independent external evaluation consists of 10% of the total project budget. Given the rigor of the evaluation design and its comprehensive data collection activities, it is unclear how the evaluation can be implemented with high quality (p.e96).

In addition, there are no resumes or CVs for any of the identified external evaluators (Bellwether). This makes it difficult to determine the extent to which the evaluators are qualified and experienced to implement the proposed rigorous design (p. e57).

Reader's Score: 17

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 evaluation includes sufficient methods of implementation and formative data collection across the first two years at five sites (p. e48). This will enable the project to refine major components and determine progress toward its intended outcomes.

Data collected on the teacher, student, and leader participant levels are sufficient and will provide an opportunity to pilot instruments for later fielding (p. e48).

The external evaluator intends to use multiple modes of communication to the project and will meet bi-weekly or monthly. This is sufficient to provide timely formative information so that the project can make appropriate mid-course corrections as needed (p. e49).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses 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:

The logic model clearly articulates the project's core components (p. e77) along with sufficient descriptions of mediators and the relationship to project outcomes. This will serve as a useable roadmap for the evaluation and project to guide both implementation and evaluation activities.

The evaluation team will work with the project team to identify implementation thresholds related to participation, dose, adherence, and quality. These are adequate variables that could contribute to project outcomes (p. e50).

The evaluation team will determine implementation fidelity scores for each site once the thresholds have been identified. This will ensure that the resultant analytic sample is qualified (p. e51).

Sub

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 10/11/2022 02:40 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 10/11/2022 01:00 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Fugees Family (S411C220154)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	30	28
Total	30	28

Technical Review Form

Panel #7 - EIR Tier 2 - 3: 84.411C

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Fugees Family (S411C220154)

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:

The evaluation meets most of the requirements for the What Works Clearinghouse with reservations. For example, the matching process is detailed and will include blocking at the school and student levels (p. e47). The baseline measures used in the study will provide useful data to inform comparisons during the study (p. e47). The evaluation plan will produce useful data to provide information on the impact of the project. For example, the authors include a clear plan to answer and address each research question with either validated measures or a plan to develop and validate measures (p. e46). The outlined analysis of the collected data will produce results that will be useful for project staff and for use in future research (p. e47).

Weaknesses:

The evaluation does not address attrition of the students or schools (p. e46). It is unclear if the identified evaluators have sufficient experience to implement the planned evaluation as the proposal lacks resumes for the identified staff (p. e43).

Reader's Score: 18

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 evaluation includes a clear plan to collect and report data throughout the planned activities of the project. For example, the authors will develop and conduct surveys annually with all participants to identify areas of concern and to measure fidelity (p. e49). The evaluation includes a sufficient timeline for reporting that will allow for changes to be made to project activities (p. e49). The qualitative and quantitative data collected through the evaluation will sufficiently address all of the research questions (p. e49).

Sub

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were 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:

The narrative includes a discussion of the process that will be used to develop implementation thresholds to guide activities and provide information to project staff (p. e48 & e51). The evaluation collects data that will address the research questions, which are aligned to the overall objectives of the project (p. e50). The evaluation also includes a clear description of how mediators will be considered during the analysis of the project activities (p. e50).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 10/11/2022 01:00 AM