

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 - 7

Applicant Name Lowell Public Schools **PR/Award No** U215J140023

Questions

	Points Possible	Points Scored
1. Selection Criteria		
Project Design	25	22
Adequacy of Resources	20	20
Management Plan	25	25
Project Services	20	17
Project Evaluation	10	8
TOTAL	100	92

Priority Questions

1. Competitive Preference Priority: Promise Zones

CPP: Promise Zones	3	0
<hr/>		
TOTAL	3	0
<hr/>		
GRAND TOTAL	103	92

Technical Review Form

Applicant Name Lowell Public Schools **PR/Award No** U215J140023

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 provided comprehensive details on the demographic characteristics of the students, family and community to be served by the project as indicated by the details provided on students including assessment scores that are well below the state averages (pg. 1); high free/reduced lunch rate of 85% (pg. 2); proposed enrollment numbers (pg. 2); and detailed information on disciplinary action - 1,319 disciplinary actions in one year committed by 78 students (pg. 3). Detailed community and family data were also provided in a detailed and documented format including a high poverty rate (pg. 6); a high crime rate (pg. 6); and facility needs (pg. 5).

The applicant provided detailed data on surveys that were conducted to demonstrate that the community has agreed to participate in the project activities through the use of Facebook surveys. Results indicated that 82-88% of those surveyed will participate in proposed activities (pg. 7).

The applicant provided extensive details on the proposed activities that will be provided to students, families, and the community that are directly tied to the needs of the target population. For example, the applicant proposed to provide mentoring and remedial education services that are directly linked to student academic needs identified (pg. 8). The applicant provided comprehensive details on the providers of the proposed services, and the intensity and target population to be served, including the number of proposed unduplicated populations (pg. 9-12).

The applicant provided an excellent sustainability plan that included detailed activities that will take place each project year and will include grantwriting training to the community, facility upgrades, and coordination of existing services such as health services and the food pantry (pg. 12-14).

The applicant provided extensive details on how this project will be integrated with existing and proposed efforts as evidenced by their details on programs such as Naviance, a college and career readiness web-based platform that will provide online discovery services to students and community adults (pg. 15). In addition, the applicant provided a comprehensive explanation of existing and future grants that will be linked directly to this project design to ensure a successful pooling of funding streams to directly benefit the target population as evidenced by their a Youth Mental Health First Aide training grant, and a Governor's Office grant to provide

competency based grading system for students (pg. 15-16).

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not state their outcomes for the proposed project in measurable terms. For example, the applicant stated they will increase the English as a Second Language certificate attainment of community members, yet it is not clear by how much they propose to increase this attainment, or what the current benchmark is for this proposed activity to determine the true proposed project impact (pg. 8-12).

Question Status: Completed

Reviewer Score: 22

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 provided sufficient details to demonstrate their strong support of the project through the use of their existing and community facilities, supplies, and partners. For example, the applicant has committed 180 volunteer hours to conduct facility repairs such as painting, and have committed a 21% match to the project (pg. 17).

The applicant provided significant details on how this proposed project will collaborate with other existing programs such as the 21st Century Afterschool Program, and the Christ Jubilee Church who maintains a current food pantry that will be expanded through this project (pg. 19-20). Each partner is clearly identified in the proposed project activities and design plan with details provided on how many hours of services will be provided specifically for this project and

what staff commitments will be made to project activities. For example, the applicant provides evidence that dual enrollment opportunities will be provided to students through Middlesex Community College (pg. 22).

The applicant provided evidence of reasonable costs for this project as evidenced by their information on the national economic impact indicators that clearly identified the economic impact of high school graduates vs. high school drop outs (pg. 24); and an appropriate cost per student of \$4,972 over the life of the grant which is an investment that will double on return in the first half-year of the post project employment for the students to be served (pg. 25).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were identified.

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 provided a detailed timeline of proposed activities for all four years of the project that clearly illustrates when activities will be completed (pg. 28). In addition, the applicant provides a detailed organizational chart to demonstrate all proposed new staff and existing project staff and partner staff that will assist with the day-to-day operation of the project, including their school superintendent, and a Coordinator of Special Programs through a partnering agency (pg. 29).

The applicant provided adequate details on the qualifications for the proposed full time coordinator and other key staff, and included a detailed job description in the Appendix that clearly described this position's role and responsibilities for the project (Pg. 30 and Appendix).

The applicant's inclusion of a full time project coordinator and two other full time staff members is justified when compared to the role and responsibilities of this project (Appendix).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were identified.

Question Status: Completed

Reviewer Score: 25

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 adequate evidence of research that was used to design project components such as the Harvard Family Research Project that was used to organize their

community and family-based programs (pg. 31).

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not provide adequate evidence that the proposed activities will lead to improvements in the achievement of students as measured against rigorous academic standards, as no academic standards are mentioned in this proposal.

Question Status: Completed

Reviewer Score: 17

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 provided adequate details on who will conduct an external evaluation including details to justify the proposed evaluator's experience in project evaluation (pg. 33).

The applicant provided a detailed plan on how they will collect both qualitative (school/community questionnaires), and quantitative (student assessment scores) to determine project effectiveness (pg. 33). In addition, the applicant provided significant details to determine the cost effectiveness of their proposed strategies (pg. 34-35). Data collection points included adequate strategies for replicating and testing project interventions in multiple settings such as their proposed use of a quasi-experimental evaluation design to measure the various impacts of their proposed activities on the target populations (pg. 34).

The applicant provided details to support their evaluation plan including the data instruments that will be used to determine program effectiveness including student disciplinary data and student information system data (pg. 33).

Weaknesses:

The applicant's inclusion of measurable objectives or project outcomes will make it difficult to determine project success and impact. In addition, the applicant provided vague statements of how often they will review data to determine project success and to make adjustments to the project design by stating they would do this "periodically" and on an "ongoing basis", which does not clearly define describe how they will provide timely and valid evaluation information on proposed project activities. Definitive plans were not included (pg. 35).

Question Status: Completed

Reviewer Score: 8

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

N/A

Weaknesses

N/A

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 - 7

Applicant Name Lowell Public Schools **PR/Award No** U215J140023

Questions

	Points Possible	Points Scored
1. Selection Criteria		
Project Design	25	22
Adequacy of Resources	20	18
Management Plan	25	25
Project Services	20	18
Project Evaluation	10	8
TOTAL	100	91

Priority Questions

1. Competitive Preference Priority: Promise Zones

CPP: Promise Zones	3	0
<hr/>		
TOTAL	3	0
<hr/>		
GRAND TOTAL	103	91

Technical Review Form

Applicant Name Lowell Public Schools **PR/Award No** U215J140023

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:

Applicant identified a goal of proposed project to increase academic achievement and attainment for students by impacting attendance, learning, health, behavior and school connectedness; parent engagement with youth and community, educational attainment and employment; community with health, school-community connectedness, educational attainment and employment (p. e13).

Applicant identified community and school target population to be served, (p.1) and clearly identified demographics of this population. For example, in the community poverty rate, household income and community violence (p. 1 & 9) were documented and school district identified with student demographics: English Learners, low income and high needs academics (p. 1 & 2), attendance and disciplinary actions including suspensions and academic achievement (p. 3).

Applicant identified projected enrollment of students to be served (p. 7).

Applicant provided a clear chart of student needs, parent needs and neighborhood needs and aligned these needs with eligible services (p. 8).

Applicant provided a comprehensive overview of proposed services, service provider, population to be served, frequency of services, and measurable outcomes to be documented from services (p 9 – 12).

Applicant documented district's commitment to the improvement of students in the targeted school with funding a Director of Alternative Education (p. 13).

Applicant explained Project LEARN, an organization developed by the local business community, school district, University of Massachusetts Lowell and local community foundation, which has the mission to help students through strategic planning and long range planning to sustain services beyond the grant (p. 19 & 20).

Applicant clearly described integration of existing services with proposed services. For example, Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) (p. 14); employer partnerships and work-based learning (p. 15); Naviance, a student web-based system, to explore college and career

readiness (p. 15); Youth Mental Health First Aide (YMHFA), (p. 15).

Additionally the applicant described multiple local resources to support continuation of services (p. 16).

The applicant explained the four local collaborative with which the FSCS Coordinator will participate to continue looking for funding sources (p. 16).

Weakness: The applicant failed to provide measurable outcomes to ensure accurate assessment of the proposed project.

Question Status: Completed

Reviewer Score: 22

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:

Resources for the proposed project, federal and matching funds, appeared adequate.

Applicant described how the school site and church next door will be able to provide facilities to accommodate all proposed services (p. 17).

Applicant clearly described the necessary equipment (lap top and printer for FSCS Coordinator) and necessary supplies and instructional materials for implementation of services with proposed grant funding (budget narrative p. 8 & 9).

Applicant clearly described personnel and contractual services to be provided through the proposed project (budget narrative p. 2 – 7 and 10 – 15).

Applicant clearly described personnel and services to be provided by consortium partners (Appendix C pp 75 – 82)

Applicant provided a chart to demonstrate involvement of each partner with the proposed project (p. 18).

Additionally the applicant provided a comprehensive description of the services each partner will provide (pps 19 – 24). The array of services include the 12 eligible services for the FSCS grant.

A Memorandum of Understand (MOU) from partners were provided which indicated support and commitment to the project (Appendix B, pp 58 – 73).

The unduplicated per student investment over the five years of the grant will be \$4,972.00 (p. 25). When compared to the income of a high-school drop-out and the loss to the national economy, the costs appear reasonable (p.24). Additionally when unemployment and incarceration rates were considered for high-school drop-outs, per pupil costs appeared reasonable and justified (p. 25).

Weaknesses:

Applicant failed to identify per participant cost to determine reasonableness of the costs.

Question Status: Completed

Reviewer Score: 18

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 an Advisory Council, representing partners, parents, teachers and the FSCS Coordinator and school Director/Principal and a Youth Council to provide proposed project over-sight (p. 25).

The applicant provided a comprehensive Management Plan, Table 6), and detailing Activities, responsibilities of key Personnel and Timeline for the proposed project (pps 26 – 28).

The applicant provided a clear Organizational Chart (p 29).

The applicant provided a comprehensive job description for a full time FSCS coordinator (Appendix A, pp 37-38). The job description details the responsibilities of the FSCS coordinator in managing and leading the program. The applicant will seek a highly qualified candidate with experience in working with the services to be provided in the proposed project.

The applicant provided a clear and comprehensive job description for the Community Team Work Case Manager and Construction Trainer (Appendix A, pp. 47-50).

The applicant provided resumes documenting the appropriate background and experiences of the FSCS Principal (Director of Alternative Education); Asst. Superintendent for Student Services; Executive Director Project Learn and Evaluator (Appendix A).

The FSCS Coordinator, Case Manager and Construction Trainer will be full time positions (budget narrative) which will be appropriate and necessary to implement and monitor the services of the proposed project.

The time allocation for the District Superintendent, Asst. Superintendent for Student Services, Principal/Director of Alternative Education and Coordinator of Special Programs were identified in the Organizational Chart (p. 29) and appeared appropriate to support the full time proposed project personnel.

No weaknesses identified.

Question Status: Completed

Reviewer Score: 25

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 comprehensive research citations to document the alignment of proposed services and effective practice (Appendix D, pp. 83 -87).

The applicant identified three research studies to support the improved academic attainment of students when involved in the proposed services (Appendix D, p. 87).

Additionally the applicant identified the Harvard Family Research Project has documented the increased academic achievement of students when schools partner with family and community (p. 31).

Weaknesses: The applicant failed to clearly describe how the services will lead to improved student achievement.

Question Status: Completed

Reviewer Score: 18

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 described how timely and valid information will be collected. Evaluator will receive minutes from all project meetings to develop a history⁶ and timeline as well as lessons learned to inform on going programming (p. 32).

Additionally the evaluator will collect each month "On-Time and Targets Reached "scores to monitor planning and activation of services (p. 32).

The applicant will contract with an outside evaluator and proposed a comprehensive and thorough evaluation plan (p. 32).

Applicant discussed district's interest to have the proposed FSCS become a model, demonstration site for other districts (p.13).

The applicant identified five broad questions to guide the evaluation process (p. 32).

Additionally the applicant identified five core process indicators on which data will be collected for each service to analyze services (p. 32).

Outcome evaluation will be mixed-method, using school administrative data, to track standardized assessment scores, disciplinary incidents, graduation rate and attendance (p. 33).

School and community questionnaires will be used to gain analyze feelings of safety, school climate, school, and family and community connections (p. 33).

Weaknesses: Applicant failed to provide baseline data with which to determine a starting point for the assessment in the evaluation which will limit determine success of the proposed project.

Question Status: Completed

Reviewer Score: 8

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 did not address this priority”

Weaknesses

“The applicant did not address this priority”

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 - 7

Applicant Name Lowell Public Schools **PR/Award No** U215J140023

Questions

	Points Possible	Points Scored
1. Selection Criteria		
Project Design	25	23
Adequacy of Resources	20	20
Management Plan	25	25
Project Services	20	18
Project Evaluation	10	8
TOTAL	100	94

Priority Questions

1. Competitive Preference Priority: Promise Zones

CPP: Promise Zones	3	0
<hr/>		
TOTAL	3	0
<hr/>		
GRAND TOTAL	103	94

Technical Review Form

Applicant Name Lowell Public Schools **PR/Award No** U215J140023

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 presented a detailed plan to address the low academic achievement and the behavioral needs of the students and the concerns of the parents and community. Eligible services were detailed in a plan on pages 6-12 to address the identified needs of the school and community.

The Lowell community is home to a diverse refugee and immigrant population. Nearly 25% of the population reported they were “foreign born” in the 2010 census (p. 1). The applicant reported that all but one of the 24 schools in the Lowell Public Schools District are Title 1 schools. LPS is identified by the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education as a “high needs” district. Barriers such as poverty and language were identified as weaknesses (p. 1). The Lowell High School Career Academy (LHSCA) opened as a reorganized alternative school in 2013 with a seed grant of \$70,000. The applicant indicates that the project will serve 360 unduplicated high needs high school student, and 3,000 unduplicated family and community members (pp. 6-9). The first class enrolled 78 students and the applicant projects the number to grow to 200 by 2016-17 (p. 2). The applicant indicates that the majority of students at LHSCA qualify for free lunch, 25% are ELL and the population is 42% Hispanic/Latino, 27% White, 18% Asian, 9% African American, and 4% multiracial. The school had 1,319 disciplinary actions in 2013-2014 and 312 in-school suspensions and 228 out-of-school suspensions. The majority of students are at risk of not graduating (pp. 4-5). Needs assessments administered to parents and students indicated that services such as tutoring, mentoring, sports, career counseling, and after school programs would be of interest; more so by parents. The applicant also reported an increasing crime rate, higher unemployment, and decreasing total population (pp.4-5). Residents in the surrounding community reported concerns about income, youth crime, unemployment, safety, and disorganization in the community (p. 7). The tables provided on pages 6-9 present an overview of the 8 eligible services that will be provided to students and the 5 eligible service that will be provided to family and community members. The frequency of the services and the responsible partners are presented in the table. The district has provided resources and services and has plans to assess the effectiveness of the model to expand it to other schools and to present findings to stakeholders (p. 13). The school has also partnered with Project LEARN to develop strategic planning for sustainability and

growth (p. 13).

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not provide baseline data for the criteria being measured. The applicant did not present specific, measurable goals.

Question Status: Completed

Reviewer Score: 23

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 the project partners and their roles and responsibilities. The frequency of the services was presented and MOUs were provided with details of specific contributions. The applicant identified matching funds and resources, such as the church facility, which have been contributed to assist in the implementation of services. The applicant presented matching funds in the amount of \$230,000 for the school district and \$666,000 from partner organizations and funders (17-20, Appendix).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were identified.

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 presented a timeline which included milestones and responsible parties. A FSCS will be hired and a description of the roles and responsibilities for that individual were presented. The applicant provided a plan for meetings involving the FSCS and advisor, parents, and youth. The FSCS will also meet weekly with the Director of Alternative Education (Principal (p. 29)) and collaborate with schools personnel. All staff who delivery services will engage in quarterly 1.5 hour meetings to discuss the project and for professional development. The qualifications and experiences of the identified and proposed personnel appear to be relevant to the identifies roles and responsibilities.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were identified.

Question Status: Completed

Reviewer Score: 25

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 presented research references throughout and cited evidence-based practices such as PBIS, SAMHSA, USDA FARM to School and wrap around services to support the components of the project. In text notations and a reference page were included in the proposal (Appendix pages 83-87). The applicant references the Harvard Family Research Project as evidence that the partnering of community-based organizations, schools, and families leads to increases in academic achievement and suggested that the project aligns with the findings (p. 31).

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not specifically indicate how the proposed services related to aligned with specific outcomes in achievement, as identified by the Harvard Family Research Project.

Question Status: Completed

Reviewer Score: 18

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 data collection will produce both qualitative and quantitative data. The applicant reported that an outside evaluator will be hired. The applicant reported that the partners are working to ensure that culturally normed assessments are administered, and identified components of the plans to collect relevant data. The process for analysis and reporting findings was presented and will occur through periodic and annual reports. A plan to present details to stakeholders interested in replicating the project was also addressed (pp. 32-35). The project staff will collect data on the various services provided (p. 32). The applicant provided a plan that included quarterly evaluations and plans for reporting findings for each year of the grant in a table on pages 26-29.

Weaknesses:

It is unclear how the applicant plans to assess the data based on some of the vague outcome measures. The applicant does not provide clear indication on how these outcomes are sufficient to assess each component of the program. More details and clarity on the outcome measures would provide a more clear indication of the efficacy of the evaluation plan.

Question Status: Completed

Reviewer Score: 8

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 did not address this priority.

Weaknesses

The applicant did not address this priority.

Question Status: Completed

Reviewer Score: 0