

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/31/2010 10:19 AM

### Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Greater Lawrence Community Action Council, Inc. -- Community Partnerships for Children,  
(U215J100051)

**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              | 25            |
| <b>Quality of Project Services</b>       |                 |               |
| 1. Project Services                      | 20              | 20            |
| <b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b> |                 |               |
| 1. Project Evaluation                    | 10              | 10            |
| <b>Sub Total</b>                         | 100             | 100           |
| <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             | 102           |

# Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - Panel - 3: 84.215J

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

Applicant: Greater Lawrence Community Action Council, Inc. -- Community Partnerships for Children, (U215J100051)

## 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 applicant provided extensive demographic information of the community and their needs, including data that demonstrates this community is one of the poorest in the state, has the lowest graduation rate in the state, and the highest percentage of children in the state that speak another language at home other than English.

The applicant addressed 9 eligible areas that they will focus on in their community. A detailed description of the number of participants in each program, the frequency of services and how family members would be involved was clearly justified. The need of the community was convincing.

#### Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

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:**

A Memorandum of Understanding was provided that clearly delineates 9 partnering agencies responsibilities was included in the application. The description of the partnerships provides sound evidence that the partners bring a wealth of expertise and resources.

The budget is reasonable especially considering the wide range of activities planned addressing 9 different areas.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses found.

**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 applicant has the expertise and experience required to manage a grant of this size. There is evidence presented of a 45 year history of successfully managing large federally funded programs.

The management plan includes weekly planning sessions for 3 months to ensure the implementation of services in a timely fashion. After start up, monthly partner meetings will continue to ensure oversight of the program. The staff members of the applicant organization and the partners are highly qualified and have the experience needed to ensure success. The application provides evidence that staff members will have adequate time to meet the project objectives.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses found

**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 applicant provided references to the quality of their program throughout the application. The research provided demonstrates that the activities/programs planned in this application have a high success rate. Information showed that the project is using up-to-date information from research and from actual practice. Some of the programs the applicant proposed are extensions of successful programs they are already using.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses found

**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 applicant provided references to the quality of their program throughout the application. The research provided demonstrates that the activities/programs planned in this application have a high success rate. Information showed that the project is using up-to-date information from research and from actual practice. Some of the programs the applicant proposed are extensions of successful programs they are already using. The applicant intends to create a model program that includes monthly meetings to review progress. There is good history of evaluation. Replication of program is discussed.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses found.

**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:**

The applicant provided compelling data demonstrating why they should receive the competitive preference priority; including 71% of the targeted middle school receiving Needs Improvement or Warning/Failing on English Language Arts and 89% scoring Needs Improvement or Warning/Failing on the Math portion of the test. In Science and Technology, 91% students in grades 5 & 8 received a scoring of Needs Improvement or Warning/Failing.

The target middle school has not Adequate Yearly Progress since 2006.

The applicant provided convincing documentation of the health, academic and social services they will provide and how this will impact their community.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses found.

**Reader's Score: 2**

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 08/31/2010 10:19 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/02/2010 03:07 PM

### Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Greater Lawrence Community Action Council, Inc. -- Community Partnerships for Children,  
(U215J100051)

**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              | 20            |
| <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              | 10            |
| <b>Sub Total</b>                         | 100             | 100           |
| <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             | 102           |

# Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - Panel - 3: 84.215J

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

Applicant: Greater Lawrence Community Action Council, Inc. -- Community Partnerships for Children, (U215J100051)

## 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 provided a succinct list of its objectives, all related specifically to the priority for this competition, p. 1 of narrative, with measures clearly provided in evaluation section that will determine success rate of achieving these objectives. The 89.4 percent of Hispanic-speaking students represents the highest percentage in the state, resulting in high numbers of ELL students, and the city has the lowest median income in the state for the city population being substantially greater than that of Hispanic family incomes. 96 percent of students receive FRL and the graduation rate of 48.1 percent is the lowest in the state. Academically the picture is grim with 63 percent scoring in Needs Improvement or Warning Failing on the ELA and math state tests, p. 4. Graphic isolation for services is uniquely depicted in the map on p. e6, clearly illustrating the needs explained in the narrative.

#### Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were found.

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:**

Informative chart on p. e0 provided in-kind matches from community organizations partners. The MOU provides contributions and commitments for each partner, with notable desired results and outcomes included, a real plus for this application. Another strong element of this project is the plan to utilize a data team toolkit from the state DOE that will create a culture of inquiry and research characterized by collaborative learning and reflective practice, p. 8. More importantly, the Principal will be an active member of the data team, a real hallmark of strength for transforming this middle school. The specific lists of services provided by each partner on pp.8 and 9 provides a clear vision of how this project will achieve its objectives. Providing services for 2,373 individuals on p. 10 includes students and family members.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were found.

**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:**

Qualifications and specified roles are clearly provided in CVs and resumes of key personnel, a strong component of this application. Planning committee stipends are another plus for the significant amount of time this group will devote to assuring this project is implemented as planned, p. e7, Partners Budget page 5. Planning and management is replete throughout the application, providing a clear picture for implementation and potential of project success.

**Weaknesses:**

None were found.

**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:**

Throughout the application, current research findings and a clear pathway for achieving success is provided for each type of service proposed for this project, which fortifies a clear picture of how this applicant will ensure student success academically, mentally, socially and physically.

**Weaknesses:**

None were found.

**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:**

Involvement of an evaluator from the planning stage for this project is evident throughout the application, with specific objectives, outcomes and milestones clearly indicated at multiple points where services are described. Monthly evaluation meetings with analyses of results presented will provide extensive avenues of feedback for program improvement, ensuring yet again another method toward project success. The intention to create a model project strengthens the opportunity for replication. Providing a web-based data reporting system on p. 29 is a unique strength that will make it easy for all participating partners and school personnel to readily update results, really making the evaluation tasks feasible for immediate feedback. Web conferencing offers yet another strength to keep project partners involved and informed of ongoing results.

**Weaknesses:**

None were found.

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:

The middle school is identified as a persistently lowest achieving school, a Level 4 school by the MA Dept of Elem and Secondary Education and is implementing a transformation model.

#### Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were found.

Reader's Score: 2

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 09/02/2010 03:07 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/31/2010 06:27 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Greater Lawrence Community Action Council, Inc. -- Community Partnerships for Children,  
(U215J100051)

**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              | 25            |
| <b>Quality of Project Services</b>       |                 |               |
| 1. Project Services                      | 20              | 20            |
| <b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b> |                 |               |
| 1. Project Evaluation                    | 10              | 10            |
| <b>Sub Total</b>                         | 100             | 100           |
| <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             | 102           |

# Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - Panel - 3: 84.215J

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

Applicant: Greater Lawrence Community Action Council, Inc. -- Community Partnerships for Children, (U215J100051)

## 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:

A significant strength is the involvement of focus groups prior the onset of the project in assessing and identifying the needs of the students and their families for this project.

The objectives are clearly communicated with reasonable targets set with timelines in place throughout the project.

The proposal outlines nine (9) of the twelve (12) absolute priorities that will be incorporated throughout this project.

Throughout the narrative, the importance of families and their involvement in the process is clearly communicated. They are seen as a vital role in order for this project to be successful.

Demographic characteristics were effectively communicated. Statistics that are prominent include; Lawrence has the 2nd highest percentage of children who receive free or reduced lunch, the percentage of single-headed households, and the low percentage of 4-year high school graduation rate of 48.1%. Continuing, 63% of the students who participated in the state assessment test scored either Needs Improvement or Warning/Failing. These percentages were even higher for middle school state wide assessment in both English Language Arts and Math.

#### Weaknesses:

There were no weaknesses found in the area of Quality of Project Design.

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 adequacy of resources was integrated through the project narrative for each prospective partner. Provided for each partner is a comprehensive overview of their background, their commitment to the project, what absolute priority is their focus and the objectives set forth for them.

The budget for each respective partner was provided in the budget narrative. Providing those details assisted the reader in assessing the adequacy and reasonableness of funds given the scope of work.

A significant strength regarding adequacy of resources is the involvement of the principal as a primary team member.

**Weaknesses:**

There were no weaknesses found in the area of Adequacy of Resources.

**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 partners are highly qualified and bring prior successful experiences to the collaboration. There are services that are outlined the partners already offer that will be continued or extended; few will be created.

There is a strong history in the organization of designing, maintaining, and managing other federal grants.

A significant strength is the weekly and monthly scheduled meetings by management.

The key personnel that are in place for their respective roles are highly qualified and bring a wealth of expertise to this project. For the positions that are vacant, job descriptions were provided in the resume section.

**Weaknesses:**

There were no weaknesses found in the area of Quality of the Management Plan.

**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:**

Throughout the narrative in each of the prospective partners, research was integrated as necessary.

The objectives set forth in this proposal are set to lead to improvements in achievement of students against academic standards and there is a plan in place to utilize data to make decisions and develop action steps to support improvement throughout this grant.

**Weaknesses:**

There were no weaknesses found in the area of Quality of Project Services.

**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:**

A significant strength of this evaluation plan in addition to a highly qualified external evaluator is the plan to replicate this project and implement it as a model at other sites.

**Weaknesses:**

There are no weaknesses in the area of Quality of Project Evaluation.

**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:**

Competitive Preference Priority is specifically addressed in their proposal indicating the implementation of the Transformation Model as their corrective action.

**Weaknesses:**

There were no weaknesses found in the area of Competitive Preference Priority.

**Reader's Score: 2**

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 08/31/2010 06:27 PM