

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/01/2010 10:02 AM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Children & Families First -- , (U215J100072)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	25	25
<b>Adequacy of Resources</b>		
1. Adequacy of Resources	20	20
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	25	24
<b>Quality of Project Services</b>		
1. Project Services	20	20
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	10	8
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	97
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
1. Competitive Preference	2	2
<b>Sub Total</b>	2	2
<b>Total</b>	102	99

# Technical Review Form

Panel #24 - Panel - 24: 84.215J

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

Applicant: Children & Families First -- , (U215J100072)

## 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 proposed project is extremely well-designed, building on the six months of implementation in 2009 to anticipate a better management structure (moving from one site coordinator to three, one per site, and adding oversight). Parents, educators, and providers appear to have appropriate input and involvement in the proposed project. The proposed parent leadership is excellent and should meaningfully contribute to the project's success. The proposal thoroughly describes the students, families, and community needs including demographics, social issues, and academics, and provides well-thought-out estimates of the number of individuals to be served. The proposal describes not only the services to be provided, but the rationale for each, how individuals will be targeted, and the frequency of service provision. Services represent a wide array of social, emotional, and academic supports.

#### 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:

The partners involved in this proposal have demonstrated impressive support for the proposed project. The FSCS will involve a new health services facility, as well as leveraging the resources of the community including arts programming

and health facilities. The proposed project builds on services offered to date, both renewing funding for a key position and adding positions to better support the three schools. The proposal does not involve a great many facilities or equipment; the resources are more services-oriented, and those appear well-targeted and sufficient to address identified needs. The costs per student are somewhat high, but within reason given the comprehensive nature of the services and the identified needs.

**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:**

The proposal has clearly benefited from the 2009 implementation, as it presents a useful, workable management structure that allows both for site individuality and for capturing economies of scale. The principal is described as co-determining services, which in schools undertaking significant reform is absolutely necessary for a project to succeed. The project director brings both school-level experience, which will help the project fit within the school environment, and fundraising experience, demonstrated through the extensive backing the proposed project has already received. The current site administrator seems well-equipped for the task, leading this reviewer to presume that the two site administrators and the program manager, as well as other staff to be identified and hired, will be similarly well-qualified. Personnel commitments are appropriate to the proposed work, including the administrative staff, which are paid for minimally out of the grant's proposed budget. The involvement of paid parents is likely to enhance the proposed project's impact and outreach in the community.

**Weaknesses:**

The proposal would benefit from more detail on the frequency of meetings for the various coordinating committees, as well as a timeline, especially for the initial start-up year.

**Reader's Score: 24**

**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:**

This project reflects very strong, research-proven programs such as the visiting nurse program, one of the few programs that has definitive research on outcomes. The services impressively target children beginning before birth, with programs directed (differently) to pregnant women who are first-time vs. not-new mothers, transitioning into Parents as Teachers and offering early childhood services beginning at age 2 and 7 months. The proposal outlines a virtually seamless system of services through elementary school, targeting the highest-need students with services likely to succeed, such as home visits. The services also include a variety of community-based supports such as Big Brothers/Big Sisters. If implemented as proposed, the project should create a tightly woven safety net for children that addresses the non-academic needs they bring to school and enables the students to achieve to a much higher level.

**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:**

The proposed evaluation firm has experience in community services and this expertise should enable them to capture the processes and outcomes of the proposed project. A wide variety of data already are being collected by school systems, and the outlined evaluation will usefully take advantage of these data. The evaluation appears likely to contribute to the overall project quality by engaging the full array of stakeholders.

**Weaknesses:**

Given the experience of the proposed evaluator, the proposal should have included proposed measures of teacher engagement, parent involvement, and the work of community partners rather than deferring the entire topic to the theory of change process to be accomplished in the first year. The proposal overall, not just the evaluation section, would benefit from stated numeric goals rather than the somewhat vague "students are healthy" and "students succeed academically." It would be useful to set milestones against which progress could be gauged.

**Reader's Score:** 8

**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:**

Two of the three school sites in the proposal will be implementing the transformation school improvement model beginning school year 2010-2011. The proposal states that the FSCS grant is an integral component of the school improvement strategic plan. Proposal describes a range of appropriate services that, if delivered appropriately, should ensure that students attend school more regularly and should prepare parents to support students academically and emotionally.

**Weaknesses:**

None noted.

**Reader's Score:** 2

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 09/01/2010 10:02 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/30/2010 10:48 AM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Children & Families First -- , (U215J100072)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	25	25
<b>Adequacy of Resources</b>		
1. Adequacy of Resources	20	19
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	25	25
<b>Quality of Project Services</b>		
1. Project Services	20	20
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	10	9
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	98
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
1. Competitive Preference	2	2
<b>Sub Total</b>	2	2
<b>Total</b>	102	100

# Technical Review Form

Panel #24 - Panel - 24: 84.215J

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

Applicant: Children & Families First -- , (U215J100072)

## 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:

Applicant comprehensive plan does an outstanding job of first laying out this project's objectives (bottom page 2) and then demonstrating a convincing case regarding the tremendous need of this community based on exhaustive statistical demographic representations (page 3-5 narrative) from appropriate sources. Nine eligible services are presented (pages 7-15) each identifying who will be served and the number served as well as often giving the specific frequency and length of service. In addition, applicant lists on page 15 other wrap around services to be delivered in addition to those under the absolute priority, including drama activities, art appreciation and education services, and music education opportunities. Applicant also described solution regarding family transportation needs. The comprehensive design balance with the efficient leveraging of partner resources is noteworthy.

#### Weaknesses:

No weaknesses identified

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:**

Applicant describes a multitude of complementary financial resources that have been or will be leveraged in order to deliver on this comprehensive plan including a federal grant from the DE Criminal Justice Council, School Improvement Grants, Department 21st Century funding, grant from JPMorgan Chase, United Way of Delaware, Wilmington Flower Market, the Youth Philanthropy Board of the DE Community Foundation, and the Kutz Foundation (page 16). An extensive list of partners and relevant eligible service resources is listed on page 19. The scope of this project illustrated in the application demonstrates the need for effective coordination. Support includes a collaboration of many stakeholders (see page 16) in support of ECS and this project as illustrated by the number of entities represented by the signature on the MOU and their commitment to provide existing resources at no cost to the grant or district. Cost appears reasonable considering the broad scope of services provided as well as the amount of dollars leveraged to provide these services from JPMorgan Chase, United Way, and other private sources not including the value and efficiency created by wrap around service coordination (page 19).

**Weaknesses:**

Application does not effectively speak to available facility resources.

**Reader's Score: 19**

**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:**

This project has a formidable and comprehensive management plan design involving a three-tier structure including ECS Steering Committee, individual school Advisory Committees and Provider Councils as described on page 20-21. Privately funded individual site directors in an obvious strength of this application (page 17). The application appropriately includes roles and responsibilities, which are clearly defined in the MOU for all participating Partners. In addition, the Program Narrative specifies the qualifications and roles for all named Key Personnel and the qualifications of the remaining to be hired (see page 24-26 and resumes). Time commitment of Program Manager, Leslie Newman, FSCS Coordinator, and individual site directors is adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project (page 23-25). FSCS coordinator (ECS Program Manager) will be a full-time position and will oversee the ECS implementation and site directors, as well as, work with the evaluator in coordination that effort (page 23). All named participants have relevant training and experience and seem well qualified (program narrative page 23-25 and resumes).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses identified

**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:**

Applicant has delivered an aggressive and comprehensive project services roster including Early Learning, Family Engagement, Mentoring, Student Intervention, Nutrition Services, Health and Dental Care, Social Service Programs, Mental Health, and Adult Education. For each of the nine eligible ECS services applicant references research in justification for inclusion of service (pages 26-29). Applicant provides clear and convincing statements as to what each service will address and what specific work will be performed or attempted.

Services provided seem extremely relevant to the needs of the community and should lead to a high likelihood that the services provided will lead to improvements in the achievement of students as measured against rigorous academic standards. (see table page 30-31)

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses identified

**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:**

Applicant's evaluation process is designed to clearly use process and outcome methodologies and both quantitative and qualitative data. Using a range of tools including comparing academic record, behavior changes, student surveys, group and individual interview with the principal and school staff, parent interviews, program participant surveys, and evaluator observation will provide timely and valid information on the management, implementation, and efficiency of the project being evaluated (see pages 32-33). Applicant states they have developed a strong internal Performance and Quality Improvement infrastructure (page 31) as evidenced by their investment in a highly qualified full-time database manager (see resume) and their choice of highly qualified evaluator (see resume). Having a database manager (page 31) who can work along side the FSCS coordinator as a member of the evaluation team certainly gives applicant team a head start regarding a successful evaluation (see page 32), as well as being able to provide timely and valid information on the management, implementation, or efficiency of the project. Applicant states that performance data will be analyzed continuously (page 34), and will drive decisions throughout the implementation of the ECS. Applicant states that at the very least results will be shared with the school-based Advisory Committees and Steering Committee on a quarterly basis (page 35). Application states that the evaluator will provide feedback in the form of workshop for staff, short briefs, and attendance at Committee meetings (page 35).

**Weaknesses:**

Did not find where applicant provided guidance on or strategies for replicating or testing the project intervention in multiple settings outside this project.

**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:**

Applicant describes the school intervention model that would be or is being implement to improve academic outcomes for student on page 6 lists plans to 1) accelerate student achievement with comprehensive and effective instructional reforms; 2) create nurturing learning environments; 3) support a highly effective team of educators; and 4) engage parent and community as partners in education. Applicant does an outstanding job developing the need in the program narrative as well as describing the academic, social, and/or health services along with many other services that would be provided

beginning on (services broken down on page 7 and following of the program narrative). Applicant did state that ECS initiatives are working closely with CSD to align services (page 6), applicant did specifically address how the academic, social and/or health services provided would align with and support the school intervention model implemented via individual site director services. (see pages 22-23)

**Weaknesses:**

No weakness identified.

**Reader's Score: 2**

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 08/30/2010 10:48 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/30/2010 03:38 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Children & Families First -- , (U215J100072)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	25	25
<b>Adequacy of Resources</b>		
1. Adequacy of Resources	20	20
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	25	24
<b>Quality of Project Services</b>		
1. Project Services	20	20
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	10	8
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	97
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
1. Competitive Preference	2	2
<b>Sub Total</b>	2	2
<b>Total</b>	102	99

# Technical Review Form

Panel #24 - Panel - 24: 84.215J

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

Applicant: Children & Families First -- , (U215J100072)

## 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:

1,000 students at the three schools will be served by the proposed project. Grant funding will be used to train parents as Parent Resource Center volunteers, encouraging parental involvement. Henrietta Johnson Medical Center will (off-site) serve students/families from three Title I schools.

Demographic characteristics are provided, as well as information as to how frequently services will be rendered, showing that the applicant has a very clear vision as to how the funding will be used if the grant is received.

#### 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:

The applicant does an excellent job demonstrating that there are adequate resources in place for the project to be carried out. Detailed budgets indicate that there are partnering organizations that will contribute money to sponsor activities and services, but that the grant funding will go towards coordinating activities and services at three sites, hiring a head site manager and three site directors to work with and recruit different partners, programs, and parent volunteers.

The applicant estimates that partnering organizations will, upon receiving grant, bring another million to the project.

**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:**

There is a clear chain of command, painting a concrete picture as to who will be responsible for implementing different parts of the project. The applicant provides a detailed Project Narrative outlining the responsibilities of partnering organizations.

The time commitments of the project director, the FSCS coordinator, and other key project personnel all seem appropriate given the nature of the project.

**Weaknesses:**

The relationship among external partners is not adequately spelled out.

**Reader's Score: 24**

**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 goal of the project is to expand Children and Family first to three Wilmington-area schools

The project addresses five strands, four of which directly relate to student-centered programming (health and mental services, family and community engagement, early childhood, and enriched learning). The final strand addresses overarching coordination, which indicates an awareness as to the degree of cooperation that will be required to implement

such an ambitious program.

**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:**

ActKnowledge will collect academic data and participation numbers. Having a database manager is a great idea and a creative use of personnel.

**Weaknesses:**

There needs to be specific academic benchmarks ahead of time against which the applicant can measure the effect of this program on student academic progress.

**Reader's Score: 8**

**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:

Because two of the three schools wanting to implement full-service community schools programming are classified as transformation schools, and because all three are Title I schools, competitive preference seems appropriate.

#### Weaknesses:

Reader's Score: 2

---

Status: Submitted  
Last Updated: 08/30/2010 03:38 PM