

Technical Review Cover Sheet

Panel Details

Fiscal Year 2014 **CFDA/Subprogram** 84.215J **Schedule No** 1 **Tier No.** 1

Panel Name Full Service Community Schools - 6

Applicant Name Homewood Children\'s Village **PR/Award No** U215J140122

Questions

	Points Possible	Points Scored
1. Selection Criteria		
Project Design	25	25
Adequacy of Resources	20	20
Management Plan	25	22
Project Services	20	16
Project Evaluation	10	10
TOTAL	100	93

Priority Questions

1. Competitive Preference Priority: Promise Zones

CPP: Promise Zones	3	0
<hr/>		
TOTAL	3	0
<hr/>		
GRAND TOTAL	103	93

Technical Review Form

Applicant Name Homewood Children\'s Village **PR/Award No** U215J140122

Reviewer Name

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 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

(ii) 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.

(iii) The potential and planning for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing work of the applicant beyond the end of the grant.

(iv) The extent to which the proposed project will integrate with or build on similar or related efforts to improve relevant outcomes using existing funding stream from other programs or policies supported by community State and Federal Resources.

Strengths:

i. The applicant stated the desire to expressly serve children from birth through college and career. The proposed project targets the K-12 schools that serve the children and families of the targeted area's feeder pattern. Demographically, the targeted area is one of city's most racially segregated (94% African American) and economically impoverished neighborhoods, comprised of relatively large proportions of children, senior citizens and single parent households. In addition, specifically, 33% of the targeted area's residents are children and youth ages 0-21, 46% are adults ages 22-64 and approximately 21% are seniors aged 65 or older. Economically, 46% of the targeted area's population (and more than 60% of its children) live below the federal poverty level (page 15-16).

ii. The applicant clearly outlined how services would be used within the targeted area. The applicant provided a chart that detailed services and associated when students, family, and community members would participate over a five year span (page 21). The applicant also noted that the Out-of-School Time focus with the Allegheny Partnership(APOST) is a partnership of funders, intermediaries and providers dedicated to building a quality Out-of-School Time system that will contribute to the healthy successful development of young people as they progress through their school years, graduate from high school, and enter into adulthood. The applicant also stated that the YMCA Lighthouse Project is an afterschool program for teens that teaches leadership and career readiness through the media arts of film, photography, graphic design and music production (page 26). The applicant also noted that the "university-assisted" aspect of the proposed project will involve students, faculty and staff from various schools and departments at the local university will continue to design and deliver academically based community services courses and projects, offer service learning opportunities and internships, provide technical assistance, assist to evaluate programs, and conduct community-based participatory research projects.

iii. The applicant stated that it plans to sustain the plan beyond the 60 month period by pursuing public and private funding sources. Applicant stated it will solicit funds from individual donors, special events, foundations and local funding sources by which it has established significant long-term relationships. The applicant also proposes to solicit federal funds through grants distributed at the state and county levels (page 39). The Homewood Children's Village benefits from local foundation and individual support, our University Assisted partnership, corporate funding, through general grants and tax credits, and coordinated partnership programming and

will sustain the FSCS project design through those many and varied resources (page 35).

iv. The applicant noted that the proposed project will integrate with related efforts to improve relevant outcomes. Those existing funding streams will come from other programs supported by both state and federal resources. The applicant also mentioned as one of the city's most significant anchor institutions and largest employers, the local university has used its influence to leverage numerous human, financial and other resources for the applicant's partnership (page 39-40). The applicant stated that the HCV serves as the Community Partner in the Healthy Living, Healthy Learning, Healthy Lives (HL3) Project with the University of Pittsburgh in a three-year grant that leverages experiential knowledge from Homewood residents with expertise from the university, medical, and agency partners to equitably engage each group in a community-based participatory research (CBPR) partnership. The applicant also proposed that through partnerships leveraged with this grant, the HCV will seek to conduct various screenings to acquire baseline health data for all elementary school children (page 29).

Weaknesses: None

Question Status: Completed

Reviewer Score: 25

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

2. (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:

i. The applicant clearly justified the adequacy of support for facilities, equipment, supplies, and other resources to be provided by the applicant and consortium partners (pages 177-178). The applicant noted that the USDOE Grant funds \$500,000, the University of Pittsburgh School of Social Work provided work-in-kind funds to match for USDOE Grant, Richard King Mellon Foundation provides \$150,000 for each project year, and the Pittsburgh Foundations provides \$339,000.

ii. The applicant provided letters of Memorandum of Understanding for each partner in the proposed project to the implementation and success of the proposed project (pages 145-153).

iii. The applicant's costs are reasonable in relation to the number of persons to be served and services to be provided. The applicant included a chart that reflects the personnel's salaries, and for project years 2-5 assumes a 3% salary increase in each successive year for full time employees (page 177-178).

Weaknesses: None

Question Status: Completed

Reviewer Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

3. (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:

i. The applicant has an Operations and Oversight team that is responsible for the core functions of strategic planning, evaluation of programming and development. It was also noted that these offices also partner with external organizations to re-develop the physical infrastructure of the applicant's research projects to inform the work moving forward. The applicant has listed the responsibilities and roles for the school principal, the FSCS coordinator, partner entities, parents, and community members. The applicant noted that parents requesting assistance will be directed to a Social Work Intern, a Parent Partner or the school social worker based on their need (page 27). The applicant stated that each FSCS Site Director coordinates the day-to-day activities of the school; sits on the leadership team of each school to interface with school principal regarding those students who have specific attendance and behavioral challenges; supervises the AmeriCorps and HCV Fellows and Social Work Interns who make telephone calls home to parents and caregivers to identify the core issues surrounding attendance; and works with community programs that promote school attendance and positive behaviors (page 36). It was noted that additional planning occurs each summer before the following school year with the FSCS Director, the Site Director, and each school's Principal (page 42).

ii. The applicant has personnel with extensive experience in strategic planning. The applicant lists the prior performance and successes of personnel hired to meet the goals of the proposal (page 40).

iii. The applicant noted that each director/manager also has monthly meetings with the VP of Development and Community Affairs to plan for events that support their individual work. The applicant noted that the Site Director for one targeted area will be hired upon receipt of this grant. The applicant also noted that the Site Directors are members of the schools' leadership team and are on-site full-time and therefore are able to conduct daily planning, coordination, management and oversight. Each Site Director also coordinates the services with the Office of Child and Community Health and the Office of Promise Fulfillment (page 42).

Weaknesses:

It is not clear if the time commitments of all key project personnel is appropriate and adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project.

Question Status: Completed

Reviewer Score: 22

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Services

4. (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.

i. The applicant cited data for evidentiary support for in-school and out-of-school time services, mental and behavioral health supports, and nutrition programs that have been found to improve specific academic areas: dropout prevention, progressing in school and completing school for grades 6 – 12 (Dynarski et al., 2008); academic achievement (Alaimo et al., 2001; Beckett et al., 2009; Kleinman et al., 2002; Stephan et al., 2007; Weist et al., 2005); college entry, and financial support for college entry (Tierney et al., 2009) (page 45).

ii. The applicant provided information that reflects up-to-date knowledge from research that noted evidence-based mental health supports have been reported to provide effective services in an academic setting (Stephan et al., 2007; Weist et al., 2005) by improving school climate, reducing the stigma of mental illness, and boosting academic outcomes among students who utilize their services (page 51).

Weaknesses:

Based on the data provided from the eligible services, activities, programs, objectives, and results/outcomes, the applicant did not provide data to support the likelihood that all of the proposed services will lead to improvements in the achievement of students as measured against rigorous academic standards (page 52). It was noted that several of the research strategies used by the applicant had a low evidence rate of success (page 46).

Question Status: Completed

Reviewer Score: 16

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

5. (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) Will provide timely and valid information on the management, implementation, or efficiency of the project; and

(ii) Will provide guidance on or strategies for replicating or testing the project intervention in multiple settings.

(iii) Will provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes.

Strengths:

i. The applicant noted that the Deputy CEO and Director of Evaluation and Research heads the project's program design, implementation, and evaluation of services, and are able to provide timely and valid information on the management, implementation, and efficiency of the proposed project (page 53).

ii. The applicant noted that in addition to their experience as practitioners and implementers of the project for the past three years and decades of implementation experience prior to the formation of the proposal, their team has a record demonstrative of our experience with synthesis of implementation protocols, best-practice and lessons learned as published reports and peer reviewed documents (page 53).

iii. The applicant noted that the team has demonstrated capacity to conduct valuable internal evaluation of program and services for formative and summative purposes. The foundation provides up-to date and accurate data to meet program improvement and formative and summative evaluation needs. The applicant also expressed that a comprehensive case management database software system allows staff to track daily interactions with children, parents and other staff, and software allows the applicant to use statistical software to run statistical tests on data to enhance their understanding of their efficacy and to allow for improvement.

Weaknesses: None

Question Status: Completed

Reviewer Score: 10

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority: Promise Zones - Promise Zones

1. The Secretary gives competitive preference to applications that propose to work with communities that have been awarded a Promise Zone designation. Promise Zone designees have committed to establishing comprehensive, coordinated approaches in order to ensure, among our goals, that America's most vulnerable children succeed from cradle to career. This designation is designed to assist local leaders in creating jobs, increasing economic activity, improving educational opportunities, leveraging private investment, and reducing violent crime in high-poverty urban, rural, and tribal communities. Promise Zone designations establish comprehensive, coordinated approaches in order to ensure America's most vulnerable children succeed from cradle to career. By partnering with Promise Zones designees, the Federal government will help communities access the resources and expertise they need--including the resources from various neighborhood revitalization initiatives--to ensure that Federal programs and resources support the efforts to transform these communities.

Strengths

Not applicable.

Weaknesses

Not applicable.

Question Status: Completed

Reviewer Score: 0

Technical Review Cover Sheet

Panel Details

Fiscal Year 2014 **CFDA/Subprogram** 84.215J **Schedule No** 1 **Tier No.** 1

Panel Name Full Service Community Schools - 6

Applicant Name Homewood Children\'s Village **PR/Award No** U215J140122

Questions

	Points Possible	Points Scored
1. Selection Criteria		
Project Design	25	25
Adequacy of Resources	20	20
Management Plan	25	22
Project Services	20	16
Project Evaluation	10	10
TOTAL	100	93

Priority Questions

1. Competitive Preference Priority: Promise Zones

CPP: Promise Zones	3	0
--------------------	---	---

TOTAL	3	0
--------------	----------	----------

GRAND TOTAL	103	93
--------------------	------------	-----------

Technical Review Form

Applicant Name Homewood Children\'s Village **PR/Award No** U215J140122

Reviewer Name

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 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

(ii) 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.

(iii) The potential and planning for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing work of the applicant beyond the end of the grant.

(iv) The extent to which the proposed project will integrate with or build on similar or related efforts to improve relevant outcomes using existing funding stream from other programs or policies supported by community State and Federal Resources.

The applicant provides a description of the educational pipeline served by the proposed initiative, spanning early childhood through college and career and including children and families of the Homewood feeder pattern of Pittsburgh Faison K-5, Pittsburgh Lincoln K-5, and Pittsburgh Westinghouse 6-12. (p. 1)

The proposed project targets a specifically designated area of need within the identified schools' feeder pattern that has a high level of economic impoverishment, a high concentration of dropouts, significant barriers to food quality/nutrition, high incidents of crime, and low academic achievement. (pp. 1-2)

The applicant provides detailed information on the number of students, families and community members to be served by the proposed project, stratified by year and program area. (p. 7)

The applicant addresses the services and strategies of 5 of the US DOE's 12 FSCS eligible services included its project design. Services identified are appropriate to the needs of the targeted community and schools and aligned with project goals and objectives (pp. 10-20). One example of this alignment is the Bridge-to-College Program, which is designed to facilitate readiness for and access to post-secondary education and training for children in Homewood (p. 11).

The applicant provides evidence of project activities and partnerships continuing beyond the grant period through ongoing collaborative efforts with the Yale Child Study Program, the Aspen Institute, and Allegheny Partnership for Out-of-School Time. These collaborations will continue to implement intervention strategies beyond the grant funding period including: scaffolding to address the educational needs of both children and parents; and after-school programming that incorporates academic instruction and enrichment. (pp. 8-9)

No weaknesses noted.

Question Status: Completed

Reviewer Score: 25

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

2. (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.

The applicant describes a diversity of funding for the proposed project, including individual, corporate, grant, and tax-credit funding streams in alignment with eligible services, including a strong alliance with and support from the University of Pittsburgh. (p. 21)

The proposed project leverages human and fiscal resources to implement project activities toward stated outcomes, including FSCS staff in partnership with staff from the Pittsburgh Public Schools, AmeriCorps, KEYS Service Corps, Social Work interns, and the United Way. (p. 22)

The applicant details the resources necessary to support project implementation, including a description of participating school facilities, a school-based health clinic, a food distribution center, and data sharing agreements. (pp. 23-24)

Overall costs are reasonable given the services offered and number of individuals served. (p. 7 and budget narrative)

No weaknesses noted.

Question Status: Completed

Reviewer Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

3. (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.

The infrastructure of the proposed project includes an operations and oversight team consisting of the lead agency's CEO, the Office of Evaluation and Research, and the Office of Development and Community Affairs, with core functions of strategic planning, evaluation, and program development. (pp. 26-28)

The applicant provides specific information on the role of each participating staff member, including the FSCS Director (Project Manager), and building upon the previous three years of implementing the FSCS model in other Pittsburgh Schools. (p. 30)

The applicant details planning and coordination between the FSCS Director, Site Directors, and school Principals, including summer planning efforts and review of successes. (p. 28)

Weaknesses

The applicant does not allocate sufficient time for the Project Manager (designated at .5 FTE) given the responsibilities, activities and general oversight of the proposed project (Budget Narrative e177).

Question Status: Completed

Reviewer Score: 22

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Services

- 4. (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.

The applicant proposes evidence-based mental health supports with current research (Stephan et al., 2007) on the efficacy of this strategy in an academic setting (p. 37).

Weaknesses

Although the applicant cites research in support of evidence-based strategies utilized in the proposed project's design, seven of the strategies referenced in the areas of dropout prevention, out of school time and college entry are cited as "low" among evidence base. (pp. 31-35)

Question Status: Completed

Reviewer Score: 16

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

5. (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) Will provide timely and valid information on the management, implementation, or efficiency of the project; and

(ii) Will provide guidance on or strategies for replicating or testing the project intervention in multiple settings.

(iii) Will provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes.

The applicant identifies an evaluator with experience in the subject area, including the integration of qualitative data into quantitative program designs. (p. 39)

The evaluation design will utilize the Plan/Do/Study/Act cycle to monitor progress of the funded project. (p. 41)

The proposed project will provide valid and reliable performance data through methods including Common Process Indicator metrics, DOE performance measures, Common Long Term Student Outcome Metrics, qualitative program data, and program specific metrics. (p. 42)

The applicant provides strategies for replicating the project intervention in multiple settings through the development of implementation protocols, best practice and lessons learned as published reports and peer reviewed articles. (p. 39)

No weaknesses noted.

Question Status: Completed

Reviewer Score: 10

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority: Promise Zones - Promise Zones

- 1. The Secretary gives competitive preference to applications that propose to work with communities that have been awarded a Promise Zone designation. Promise Zone designees have committed to establishing comprehensive, coordinated approaches in order to ensure, among our goals, that America's most vulnerable children succeed from cradle to career. This designation is designed to assist local leaders in creating jobs, increasing economic activity, improving educational opportunities, leveraging private investment, and reducing violent crime in high-poverty urban, rural, and tribal communities. Promise Zone designations establish comprehensive, coordinated approaches in order to ensure America's most vulnerable children succeed from cradle to career. By partnering with Promise Zones designees, the Federal government will help communities access the resources and expertise they need--including the resources from various neighborhood revitalization initiatives--to ensure that Federal programs and resources support the efforts to transform these communities.**

Strengths

The applicant has not been awarded Promise Zone designation.

Weaknesses

The applicant has not been awarded Promise Zone designation.

Question Status: Completed

Reviewer Score: 0

Technical Review Cover Sheet

Panel Details

Fiscal Year 2014 **CFDA/Subprogram** 84.215J **Schedule No** 1 **Tier No.** 1

Panel Name Full Service Community Schools - 6

Applicant Name Homewood Children\'s Village **PR/Award No** U215J140122

Questions

	Points Possible	Points Scored
1. Selection Criteria		
Project Design	25	25
Adequacy of Resources	20	20
Management Plan	25	22
Project Services	20	16
Project Evaluation	10	10
TOTAL	100	93

Priority Questions

1. Competitive Preference Priority: Promise Zones

CPP: Promise Zones	3	0
<hr/>		
TOTAL	3	0
<hr/>		
GRAND TOTAL	103	93

Technical Review Form

Applicant Name Homewood Children\'s Village **PR/Award No** U215J140122

Reviewer Name

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 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

(ii) 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.

(iii) The potential and planning for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing work of the applicant beyond the end of the grant.

(iv) The extent to which the proposed project will integrate with or build on similar or related efforts to improve relevant outcomes using existing funding stream from other programs or policies supported by community State and Federal Resources.

Strengths:

- The applicant identified the social economical struggles of the community of Homewood. (pg. e 16)
- The applicant describes the schools in Homewood to be among the lowest performing and most racially segregated, and most economically disadvantaged school in Western Pennsylvania. (pg. e16)
- The applicant indicated that the proposed program will serve students Kindergarten through 12th grade and beyond in the target area. (pg. e16)
- The applicant indicated that fewer than half of the students at either schools were proficient in reading or math as evidence of low academic proficiency of the schools that will be serviced by program. (pg. e16)
- The applicant shared that 45% of Homewood community live below the poverty level and more than 80% of the students attending the targeted schools are eligible for free or reduced lunch. (pg.e16)
- The applicant provided information regarding the potential and planning for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing work of the applicant beyond the end of the grant.(pg. e30)
- The applicant did indicate that the proposed project will expand upon their existing programs with the support of the Yale Child study Center using existing funding stream from other programs or policies supported by Community State and Federal Resources by establishing the proposed program as a national model using blended funding stream. (pg.22-23)

Weaknesses:

None

Question Status: Completed

Reviewer Score: 25

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

2. (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 identified community partners such as the Allegheny Partnership for out-of-school time, the Aspen Institute, the Marker Clubhouse, etc. who agreed to provide support and resources as evidence adequacy of supports such as the University of Pittsburg, local foundations and grants. (pg. e22-34)
- The applicant provided letters of support and memorandums of understanding (MOU). (Pg. e145-153)
- The applicant indicated that the program will work with existing community programs such as Pittsburg Public schools, AmeriCorps, and the United Way of Allegany County(Pg. e36)
- The applicant did adequately describe each partner's role and responsibility to the program. (pg. 32-35)
- The applicant included a chart and project year the cost is reasonable (pg e177-178)

Weaknesses:

None

Question Status: Completed

Reviewer Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

3. (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 described a comprehensive plan that includes a description of planning, coordination, management, and oversight of the eligible services. (pg. e40-44)
- The applicant proposed personnel with extensive experience and education to meet the objectives of the proposed program. (pg. e40-44).
- The Applicant indicated that the programming and development department will also partner with external organizations to re-develop the physical infrastructure of Homewood and research projects to inform our work. (pg.e40)
- The applicant described the infrastructure of personnel that will manage the proposed program including the Office of the President/CEO; the Office of Evaluation and Research; and the Office of Development & Community Affairs. (pg. e40-43)

Weaknesses:

- The applicant does not allocate sufficient time for the project manager support the proposed program given the responsibilities to the position.

Question Status: Completed

Reviewer Score: 22

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Services

- 4. (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 research summarizing the current evidence, compiled in the What Works Clearinghouse Practice Guides, and published by National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education (IES) Sciences, U.S. Department of Education (DOE) serve as primary sources linking the selected eligible services, activities, and outcomes to a foundation of support for their efficacy.
- The applicant provided table as services and activities as evidence that the proposed project will lead to improvements in the achievement of students as measured against rigorous academic standards. (pg. e47)

Weaknesses:

- Although the applicant cite research in support of the effectiveness for each strategy utilized in the project design several of the strategies referenced did not demonstrate evidence based effectiveness. (pg. e45-49)

Question Status: Completed

Reviewer Score: 16

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

5. (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) Will provide timely and valid information on the management, implementation, or efficiency of the project; and

(ii) Will provide guidance on or strategies for replicating or testing the project intervention in multiple settings.

(iii) Will provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes.

STRENGTHS:

- The applicant identified internal capacity among non-profits of its size to conduct rigorous evaluations. (pg. e53-56)
- The applicant indicated that they will contact with the University of Pittsburg to conduct an annual external evaluation. (pg. e56)
- The applicant provided a table outlining the research questions, evaluation methods, and data sources for internal and or external evaluation of the proposed program. (pg.e56-57)

WEAKNESSES:

None

Question Status: Completed

Reviewer Score: 10

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority: Promise Zones - Promise Zones

- 1. The Secretary gives competitive preference to applications that propose to work with communities that have been awarded a Promise Zone designation. Promise Zone designees have committed to establishing comprehensive, coordinated approaches in order to ensure, among our goals, that America's most vulnerable children succeed from cradle to career. This designation is designed to assist local leaders in creating jobs, increasing economic activity, improving educational opportunities, leveraging private investment, and reducing violent crime in high-poverty urban, rural, and tribal communities. Promise Zone designations establish comprehensive, coordinated approaches in order to ensure America's most vulnerable children succeed from cradle to career. By partnering with Promise Zones designees, the Federal government will help communities access the resources and expertise they need--including the resources from various neighborhood revitalization initiatives--to ensure that Federal programs and resources support the efforts to transform these communities.**

Strengths

None

Weaknesses

The applicant proposed program will not be working with communities that have been awarded a Promise Zone designation.

Question Status: Completed

Reviewer Score: 0