

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/30/2010 08:03 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Bert Corona Charter School -- , (U215J100152)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	25	24
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Adequacy of Resources	20	20
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	25	25
Quality of Project Services		
1. Project Services	20	20
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	10	9
Sub Total	100	98
Priority Questions		
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
1. Competitive Preference	2	0
Sub Total	2	0
Total	102	98

Technical Review Form

Panel #9 - Panel - 9: 84.215J

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Bert Corona Charter School -- , (U215J100152)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. (1) The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project.
- (2) In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the extent to which the proposed project consists of a comprehensive plan that includes a description of--
 - (i) The project objectives;
 - (ii) The students, students' family members, and community to be served, including information about the demographic characteristics and needs of the students, students' family members, and other community members and the estimated number of individuals to be served; and
 - (iii) The eligible services (as listed in the Absolute Priority described elsewhere in the notice inviting applications) to be provided or coordinated by the applicant and its partner entities, how those services will meet the needs of students, students' family members, and other community members, and the frequency with which those services will be provided to students, students' family members, and community members.

Strengths:

The objectives and associated performance measures are clearly defined (page 2-4)

Abstract addresses eligible services to be provided.

The logic model is well crafted and provides a good visual representation of project plan.

The application references a needs assessment to determine the need for chosen eligible services. Good use of many reputable supporting data sources including US Census data, Los Angeles Police Department statistics, Clifornia Department of dcuactin, etc. (page 5, 7)

Weaknesses:

On page 12 of the application narrative the use of school health clinics and mental health provider El Centro Amistad is referenced. These agency partners do not appear anywhere else in the application. There is no Memorandum of Understanding of letter of support for either of these resources.

Reader's Score: 24

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

1. (1) The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources for the proposed project.
- (2) In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:
 - (i) The adequacy of support, including facilities, equipment, supplies, and other resources to be provided by the applicant and consortium partners;
 - (ii) The relevance and demonstrated commitment of each partner in the proposed project to the implementation and success of the project; and
 - (iii) The extent to which costs are reasonable in relation to the number of persons to be served and services to be provided.

Strengths:

Application budget summary appears to support project plan. Considerable match amounts presented documenting support and sustainability. Memorandums of understanding for all partners attached.

Staff resumes describe qualified choices for positions selected.

The application narrative pages 13-15 describes a broad range of existing programs to support project.

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. (1) The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project.
- (2) In determining the quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:
 - (i) The extent to which the proposed project consists of a comprehensive plan that includes a description of planning, coordination, management, and oversight of the eligible services (as listed in the Absolute Priority described elsewhere in the notice inviting applications) to be provided at each school to be served, including the role of the school principal, the FSCS coordinator, partner entities, parents, and community members;
 - (ii) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the FSCS coordinator and other key project personnel including prior performance of the applicant on similar or related efforts; and
 - (iii) The extent to which the time commitments of the project director, the FSCS coordinator, and other key project personnel are appropriate and adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project.

Strengths:

Application narrative provides a thorough overview of organizational and management plan. (page 22-26) All staff roles are clearly delineated. The assignment of a FSCS Coordinator at each school will provide an appropriate level of on-site coordination and support.

Weaknesses:

None.

Reader's Score: 25

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Services

1. (1) The Secretary considers the quality of the services to be provided by the proposed project.
- (2) In determining the quality of the project services, the Secretary considers the following:
 - (i) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project reflect up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice; and
 - (ii) The likelihood that the services to be provided by the proposed project will lead to improvements in the achievement of students as measured against rigorous academic standards.

Strengths:

Abstract states that project objectives are to be measured against State standardized test scores. Narrative pages 27-30 offers a detailed overview of services with a variety of up-to-date, credible research references.

Weaknesses:

None.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. (1) The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project.
- (2) In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the extent to which the proposed evaluation--
 - (i) Sets out methods of evaluation that include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible;
 - (ii) Will provide timely and valid information on the management, implementation, or efficiency of the project; and
 - (iii) Will provide guidance on or strategies for replicating or testing the project intervention in multiple settings.

Factors Applicants May Wish to Consider in Developing an Evaluation Plan.

The quality of the evaluation plan is one of the selection criteria by which applications in this competition will be judged. A strong evaluation plan should be included in the application narrative and should be used, as appropriate, to shape the development of the project from the beginning of the project period. The plan should include benchmarks to monitor progress toward specific project objectives and also outcome measures to assess the impact on teaching and learning or other important outcomes for project participants. More specifically, the plan should identify the individual or organization that has agreed to serve as evaluator for the project and describe the qualifications of that evaluator. The plan should describe the evaluation design, indicating: (1) what types of data will be collected; (2) when various types of data will be collected; (3) what methods will be used; (4) what instruments will be developed and when; (5) how the data will be analyzed; (6) when reports of results and outcomes will be available; and (7) how the applicant will use the information collected through the evaluation to monitor progress of the funded project and to provide accountability information both about success at the initial site and about effective strategies for replication in other settings. Applicants are encouraged to devote an appropriate level of resources to project evaluation.

Strengths:

Nice use of evaluation and key outcomes table. The use of efforts to outcomes provides a succinct view of evaluation processes. (page 4) Documented use of standardized surveys such as the California Healthy Kids Survey and others. Clear description of objectives, expected outcomes, survey assessments, and performance measured provided on page 2-4, 7)

Weaknesses:

Performance measure for Objective #6 (narrative page 4) does not match the objective. This reviewer is not sure how the increase in families that receive services is an indication of dissemination of information to the community.

No clear plan for replication noted.

Reader's Score: 9

Priority Questions

Priority Questions - Competitive Preference Priority

1. Strategies that support turning around persistently lowest-achieving schools

The Secretary gives competitive preference to applications that propose to serve persistently lowest-achieving schools and are currently implementing or plan to implement one of three school intervention models, to enable these schools to become full-service community schools. Applicants seeking to receive this priority must describe (a) the school intervention model that would be or is being implemented to improve academic outcomes for students; (b) the academic, social, and/or health services that would be provided and why; and (c) how the academic, social and/or health services provided would align with and support the school intervention model implemented.

Strengths:

None.

Weaknesses:

None.

Reader's Score: **0**

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/30/2010 08:03 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/03/2010 10:57 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Bert Corona Charter School -- , (U215J100152)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	25	25
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Adequacy of Resources	20	20
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	25	25
Quality of Project Services		
1. Project Services	20	20
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	10	9
Sub Total	100	99
Priority Questions		
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
1. Competitive Preference	2	0
Sub Total	2	0
Total	102	99

Technical Review Form

Panel #9 - Panel - 9: 84.215J

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Bert Corona Charter School -- , (U215J100152)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. (1) The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project.
- (2) In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the extent to which the proposed project consists of a comprehensive plan that includes a description of--
 - (i) The project objectives;
 - (ii) The students, students' family members, and community to be served, including information about the demographic characteristics and needs of the students, students' family members, and other community members and the estimated number of individuals to be served; and
 - (iii) The eligible services (as listed in the Absolute Priority described elsewhere in the notice inviting applications) to be provided or coordinated by the applicant and its partner entities, how those services will meet the needs of students, students' family members, and other community members, and the frequency with which those services will be provided to students, students' family members, and community members.

Strengths:

- +The project objectives are well stated and include performance measures.
- +The application of the logic model is an excellent way to monitor the progress of the project (pg. e1).
- +The applicant provides clear and concise demographic data of the target area which makes for a very compelling case.
- +The number of persons to be served is provided.
- +Enrollment and ethnic/racial data is provided for each of the five schools (pg. 5-6).
- +The eligible services are delineated and Information is provided that describes each of the interventions and the frequency of delivery (Appendix for Schedule; pgs. 11-13).

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score: 25

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

1. (1) The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources for the proposed project.
- (2) In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:
 - (i) The adequacy of support, including facilities, equipment, supplies, and other resources to be provided by the applicant and consortium partners;
 - (ii) The relevance and demonstrated commitment of each partner in the proposed project to the implementation and success of the project; and
 - (iii) The extent to which costs are reasonable in relation to the number of persons to be served and services to be provided.

Strengths:

- +Collectively, the five partners are contributing approximately \$200K per year.
- +The array of service area interventions already in place that will be accessed by the project makes the cost-benefit more

appealing (pgs. 13-17).

+The commitment of the partner schools and others is very strong. The MOU signed by the thirteen partners demonstrates that their support is unequivocal.

+Given the number of persons to be served in multiple locations and the array of interventions, it appears that the costs are reasonable.

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. (1) The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project.
- (2) In determining the quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:
 - (i) The extent to which the proposed project consists of a comprehensive plan that includes a description of planning, coordination, management, and oversight of the eligible services (as listed in the Absolute Priority described elsewhere in the notice inviting applications) to be provided at each school to be served, including the role of the school principal, the FSCS coordinator, partner entities, parents, and community members;
 - (ii) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the FSCS coordinator and other key project personnel including prior performance of the applicant on similar or related efforts; and
 - (iii) The extent to which the time commitments of the project director, the FSCS coordinator, and other key project personnel are appropriate and adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project.

Strengths:

+The management plan is well crafted in that it encompasses a centralized model of monitoring with enough leeway for each of the five school coordinators to meet their local needs.

+The reporting lines are clear and the personnel responsibilities appropriate for the various roles in the project.

+The six month planning/preparation time is well accounted for as an opportunity to recruit, set in place, advertise, and organize the delivery of services (pg. 20).

+The project director and other personnel assigned to the program are eminently well qualified. The experience and training they possess will serve them well in this endeavor. They are closely aligned to working with marginalized populations and have been doing so for many years (see resumes).

+Key personnel are devoting full-time to the project. In addition, there are a number of combined in-kind/project paid personnel who are committed to providing 10-20% of their time on a weekly basis (pg. 26).

+The staffing pattern appears to be adequate for the task at hand.

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score: 25

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Services

1. (1) The Secretary considers the quality of the services to be provided by the proposed project.
- (2) In determining the quality of the project services, the Secretary considers the following:
 - (i) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project reflect up-to-date

knowledge from research and effective practice; and

(ii) The likelihood that the services to be provided by the proposed project will lead to improvements in the achievement of students as measured against rigorous academic standards.

Strengths:

+The rationale for the concept and the various service components of the project are supported through numerous research studies and examples of other programs.

+Given the review of literature there appears to be the likelihood that the project will lead to improvements in the achievement of students (pg. 30).

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. (1) The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project.
(2) In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the extent to which the proposed evaluation--
 - (i) Sets out methods of evaluation that include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible;
 - (ii) Will provide timely and valid information on the management, implementation, or efficiency of the project; and
 - (iii) Will provide guidance on or strategies for replicating or testing the project intervention in multiple settings.

Factors Applicants May Wish to Consider in Developing an Evaluation Plan.

The quality of the evaluation plan is one of the selection criteria by which applications in this competition will be judged. A strong evaluation plan should be included in the application narrative and should be used, as appropriate, to shape the development of the project from the beginning of the project period. The plan should include benchmarks to monitor progress toward specific project objectives and also outcome measures to assess the impact on teaching and learning or other important outcomes for project participants. More specifically, the plan should identify the individual or organization that has agreed to serve as evaluator for the project and describe the qualifications of that evaluator. The plan should describe the evaluation design, indicating: (1) what types of data will be collected; (2) when various types of data will be collected; (3) what methods will be used; (4) what instruments will be developed and when; (5) how the data will be analyzed; (6) when reports of results and outcomes will be available; and (7) how the applicant will use the information collected through the evaluation to monitor progress of the funded project and to provide accountability information both about success at the initial site and about effective strategies for replication in other settings. Applicants are encouraged to devote an appropriate level of resources to project evaluation.

Strengths:

+The information provided regarding the methods of evaluation is sufficiently detailed to assume that all aspects of the project will be covered. This includes both qualitative and quantitative data as well as process and product.

+The applicant provides information on the major tasks that encompass the design and implementation phases of the project (pg. 32).

+Data will be analyzed and compared on an annual basis (pg.34).

Weaknesses:

-The applicant did not include information regarding guidance on or strategies for replicating.

Reader's Score: 9

Priority Questions

Priority Questions - Competitive Preference Priority

1. Strategies that support turning around persistently lowest-achieving schools

The Secretary gives competitive preference to applications that propose to serve persistently lowest-achieving schools and are currently implementing or plan to implement one of three school intervention models, to enable these schools to become full-service community schools. Applicants seeking to receive this priority must describe (a) the school intervention model that would be or is being implemented to improve academic outcomes for students; (b) the academic, social, and/or health services that would be provided and why; and (c) how the academic, social and/or health services provided would align with and support the school intervention model implemented.

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 09/03/2010 10:57 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/13/2010 12:56 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Bert Corona Charter School -- , (U215J100152)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	25	25
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Adequacy of Resources	20	20
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	25	25
Quality of Project Services		
1. Project Services	20	20
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	10	10
Sub Total	100	100
Priority Questions		
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
1. Competitive Preference	2	0
Sub Total	2	0
Total	102	100

Technical Review Form

Panel #9 - Panel - 9: 84.215J

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Bert Corona Charter School -- , (U215J100152)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. (1) The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project.
- (2) In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the extent to which the proposed project consists of a comprehensive plan that includes a description of--
 - (i) The project objectives;
 - (ii) The students, students' family members, and community to be served, including information about the demographic characteristics and needs of the students, students' family members, and other community members and the estimated number of individuals to be served; and
 - (iii) The eligible services (as listed in the Absolute Priority described elsewhere in the notice inviting applications) to be provided or coordinated by the applicant and its partner entities, how those services will meet the needs of students, students' family members, and other community members, and the frequency with which those services will be provided to students, students' family members, and community members.

Strengths:

1. Project objectives are tight, demanding and subject to normed measures of "success"(pps. E-2-e3).
2. Needs analysis is impressive, sobering and quantitative (e4-e5), Survey of local needs currently exists, expressed in quantitative fashion (e4-e5).
3. Lists all 11 Eligible services in explicit and convincing detail.

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 25

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

1. (1) The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources for the proposed project.
- (2) In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:
 - (i) The adequacy of support, including facilities, equipment, supplies, and other resources to be provided by the applicant and consortium partners;
 - (ii) The relevance and demonstrated commitment of each partner in the proposed project to the implementation and success of the project; and
 - (iii) The extent to which costs are reasonable in relation to the number of persons to be served and services to be provided.

Strengths:

1. While there are a lot of programs, facilities, etc. (and a strong match), this program proposes to supply a missing link: Integration and (success) measurement of community-based programs with school practice.

2. Roles and commitment of each partner is explicitly listed in MOU (# of relevant partners =11).
3. Costs are eminently reasonable (@\$135.00/client served), considering high number of students and families to be served

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. (1) The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project.
(2) In determining the quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:
 - (i) The extent to which the proposed project consists of a comprehensive plan that includes a description of planning, coordination, management, and oversight of the eligible services (as listed in the Absolute Priority described elsewhere in the notice inviting applications) to be provided at each school to be served, including the role of the school principal, the FSCS coordinator, partner entities, parents, and community members;
 - (ii) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the FSCS coordinator and other key project personnel including prior performance of the applicant on similar or related efforts; and
 - (iii) The extent to which the time commitments of the project director, the FSCS coordinator, and other key project personnel are appropriate and adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project.

Strengths:

1. Alignment of project services with LEA "regular" classroom goals and curricula a strength, implying buy-in of local principals and teachers. Outreach teams another (unique) strength of this proposal.
2. Key project personnel appear extremely well-qualified, with previous FSCS experience on hand, in person of Evaluator.
3. Job descriptions are rigorous and appropriate.
4. Principals are aligned with Program Director and FSCS Coordinators. Time commitments appear appropriate, as well.

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 25

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Services

1. (1) The Secretary considers the quality of the services to be provided by the proposed project.
(2) In determining the quality of the project services, the Secretary considers the following:
 - (i) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project reflect up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice; and
 - (ii) The likelihood that the services to be provided by the proposed project will lead to improvements in the achievement of students as measured against rigorous academic standards.

Strengths:

1. Draws upon existing research from National (Primary) sources, as well as UCLA and existing FSCS project in L. a. (part of project team). (e-4).
2. Integrates community school model with local curricula and LEA objectives, with added bonus of providing professional development activities and training.
3. High quality project services akin to these proposed have been delivered in Southern CA. by some of these same people: the only difference is the CONTEXT (here, 96% Latino) (and see: Whalen citation regarding analogous community services initiative in Chicago, 2007).
4. Reference to HCZ (Fryer, 2009) provides added evidence of knowledge and potential effectiveness. (e.g., Fryer's well-know evaluation study of HCZ).

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. (1) **The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project.**
(2) **In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the extent to which the proposed evaluation--**
 - (i) **Sets out methods of evaluation that include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible;**
 - (ii) **Will provide timely and valid information on the management, implementation, or efficiency of the project; and**
 - (iii) **Will provide guidance on or strategies for replicating or testing the project intervention in multiple settings.**

Factors Applicants May Wish to Consider in Developing an Evaluation Plan.

The quality of the evaluation plan is one of the selection criteria by which applications in this competition will be judged. A strong evaluation plan should be included in the application narrative and should be used, as appropriate, to shape the development of the project from the beginning of the project period. The plan should include benchmarks to monitor progress toward specific project objectives and also outcome measures to assess the impact on teaching and learning or other important outcomes for project participants. More specifically, the plan should identify the individual or organization that has agreed to serve as evaluator for the project and describe the qualifications of that evaluator. The plan should describe the evaluation design, indicating: (1) what types of data will be collected; (2) when various types of data will be collected; (3) what methods will be used; (4) what instruments will be developed and when; (5) how the data will be analyzed; (6) when reports of results and outcomes will be available; and (7) how the applicant will use the information collected through the evaluation to monitor progress of the funded project and to provide accountability information both about success at the initial site and about effective strategies for replication in other settings. Applicants are encouraged to devote an appropriate level of resources to project evaluation.

Strengths:

1. Ph.D. evaluator, Dr. Huang, is very strong in both quantitative and qualitative areas (Process and Outcomes), as reflected here (e-29--e-31).
As published researcher, there is every likelihood her and project's results will be disseminated widely in academic

journals\workshops.

3.This, in itself, is a replication of projects successfully carried ou elsewhere and, if successful, is likely to mimicked in other, demographically similar areas.

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 10

Priority Questions

Priority Questions - Competitive Preference Priority

1. Strategies that support turning around persistently lowest-achieving schools

The Secretary gives competitive preference to applications that propose to serve persistently lowest-achieving schools and are currently implementing or plan to implement one of three school intervention models, to enable these schools to become full-service community schools. Applicants seeking to receive this priority must describe (a) the school intervention model that would be or is being implemented to improve academic outcomes for students; (b) the academic, social, and/or health services that would be provided and why; and (c) how the academic, social and/or health services provided would align with and support the school intervention model implemented.

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Applicant is not responsive to the Notice, as described above.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/13/2010 12:56 AM