

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 - 2

Applicant Name Mary Rigg Neighborhood Center **PR/Award No** U215J140075

Questions

	Points Possible	Points Scored
1. Selection Criteria		
Project Design	25	20
Adequacy of Resources	20	20
Management Plan	25	25
Project Services	20	17
Project Evaluation	10	8
TOTAL	100	90

Priority Questions

1. Competitive Preference Priority: Promise Zones

CPP: Promise Zones	3	0
<hr/>		
TOTAL	3	0
<hr/>		
GRAND TOTAL	103	90

Technical Review Form

Applicant Name Mary Rigg Neighborhood Center **PR/Award No** U215J140075

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 addresses the absolute priority by seeking to expand the full service community school model into "the entire Near Westside neighborhood's 4 elementary schools (p. 4)."

The proposed eligible services range from early education to adult education and address the wide-ranging needs of the target population (p. 7).

The applicant provides convincing and multiple details (ie., juvenile crime, poverty, and unemployment) about the demographic characteristics and wide-ranging needs of the target of their application, the Near Westside (p. 2). The applicant presents local comparison data between the Near Westside to the rest of Marion County and adequate details about the community to be served. For example, the applicant notes that 70% of the families are on food stamps or TANF, a telling detail about the economic background of the students and the students' family members to be served.

The applicant's proposed services will be offered during after school hours, indicating that services will be provided at a high frequency.

Finally, the applicant has access to a variety of existing funding streams (p. 8) that it will integrate with the FSCS grant, if awarded. This claim is justified by the applicant's current combination of services and funding (p. 8).

Weaknesses:

The applicant states that state funding for the local district is decreasing (along with enrollment) which indicates the applicant's current access to additional funding streams may change. Following a listing of the services to be provided, the applicant does not explicitly state how those services will address the demographic needs of the Near Westside. Although the applicant notes "backward mapping" (p. 7) in order to ensure work beyond the grant, the applicant's details are limited.

Question Status: Completed

Reviewer Score: 20

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 presents adequate resources evidenced by the willingness of all community partners to provide use of their facilities and in-kind services and their past experience in managing federal and state grants (p. 9). For example, the partners will “provide in-kind \$1 for \$1 matches for grant-funded support (p. 9).”

Additionally, the applicant provides supporting documentation of the partners’ commitments (p. 54 of Appendix C). Moreover, the applicant has presented a Memorandum of Understanding from each partner (Appendix B pp. 11-53).

The applicant presents a reasonable cost of \$195/student/year and makes a sound comparison to alternative, less attractive societal costs of improving student achievement (p. 15).

The three “anchor community centers” located in the target neighborhoods are a unique strength that will “support students, parents, family members, and community members through social service programs (p. 10).”

The applicant will receive up to 60 interns from Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis to support its College Prep programs (p. 10).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

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 presents a comprehensive management plan with several details that highlights the experience of qualified key personnel, including the applicant's robust history of handling multi-year federal, state, and foundation grants (p. 16).

For example, the community school coordinator will be located at GWCS and be a part of GWCS's leadership team, however, the community school coordinator will report to the Executive Director of the Mary Rigg Center, or rather the applicant (p. 17). This management design creates autonomy to allow the community school coordinator to negotiate with partners yet make suggestions to the local school board concerning all full service community schools (p. 17).

The applicant provides thorough details of the various responsibilities associated with different management roles and community partners. For example, the school's community coordinator will facilitate services taking place in the school and assist an external evaluator with gathering

data (p. 18). The key personnel's experiences are thoroughly documented in the application and attached resumes.

The applicant provides evidence for its goal to "provide access for the Near Westside, its families and students, to outstanding educational, career, health, and social services" by demonstrating a network of schools and community centers that will "circle" the community (p. 17).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

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 specifies a number of up-to-date research resources that justify the community school model. The likely areas of improvement include: student literacy, reading, attendance, and behavior (p. 27).

The applicant will adapt the GWCS model, which has been proven effective, to new schools (p. 28).

The proposed services demonstrate the applicant's community-based focus through the use of

college students as tutors to elementary students.

Moreover, the services present a sound likelihood of student achievement through an academic and incentive based (college scholarships based on attendance and behavior) approach (p. 28).

Weaknesses:

The details about the variety of services to be provided seem lacking and somewhat inconsistent throughout the application. For example, the applicant indicates that proposed services include “Early Learning; Family Engagement; Mentoring/Youth Development; Service Learning; Job/Career Training/Counseling; Nutrition /Phys Ed; Social Services/Financial Stability; and Adult Ed. (p. 7).” Then, the applicant indicates services will primarily take place during after school hours, yet specific details about the exact variety of services are not provided in the designated application sections (many details are provided in the Quality of Management and Adequacy of Resources sections of the application). For another example, the applicant cites research about the high percentage of adults that are not connected to the community due to not having kids; however, the applicant does not explicitly connect this research to the proposed service (p. 27), although, again GED and Adult Literacy services are mentioned elsewhere in the application (p. 21). The lacking details concerning proposed services makes it difficult to review the likelihood of the success of proposed services.

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 has provided clear and comprehensive details on the proposed evaluation plan and design.

An experienced and qualified director that has previously evaluated Full-Service Communities will oversee the external evaluation (p. 29).

The evaluation design is evidence-based and follows the Extended-Term Mixed-Method Evaluation fitted to facilitate providing data that can be used for replication (p. 30).

The evaluation design allows for timely information with data collection commencing during year one, an assessment occurring during the first month of school, and on-going throughout the grant (p. 30).

The applicant presents an extensive list of settings and opportunities to share strategies and provide guidance for the replication of its program design, including interacting with community partners, presenting results at conferences, timely posts on a project website and the development of bilingual materials for the dissemination of materials (pp. 32, 34).

The data to be provided is tied to relevant outcomes such as the number of individuals targeted/served, graduation statistics, number of people knowledgeable about the services and parental participation (p. 34).

The applicant provides a helpful, well organized logic model (pp. 34-35).

Weaknesses:

The applicant provides a helpful logical model indicating the various program areas, however under the community network section, the applicant does not include any metrics that specifically deal with community members that are not connected to the community through children (see pp. 35 and 27).

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

No promise zone identified.

Weaknesses

No promise zone identified.

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 - 2

Applicant Name Mary Rigg Neighborhood Center **PR/Award No** U215J140075

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

TOTAL

3

0

GRAND TOTAL

103

92

Technical Review Form

Applicant Name Mary Rigg Neighborhood Center **PR/Award No** U215J140075

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 project plan is well developed. This application provides a comprehensive narrative on the students, students' family members, and community to be serviced. It contains a great deal of information on the problems faced by residents in the targeted community. This application presents an extensive list of figures on the crime rate, juvenile delinquency rate, unemployment rate, along with a number of other social and economic index measures (pages e16-e20).

Absolute Priority- page 10- The project will expand an FSCS.

The lists of eligible services that will be provided, which are found throughout the first few pages of the proposal, seem adequate and comprehensive (e17-e22). Pages e20 and e21 include school specific demographic information, which provides convincing information about why the eligible services are needed. Based on the specific needs of the community, the eligible services provided by the application seem relevant. The application states that 41% of adults in the service area do not have a high school diploma (e14); therefore, the proposed program will offer adult education (e22). The unemployment rate in the service area is 11% (e17); therefore, the proposed program will provide job/career/training (e22). The free/reduced lunch rate in the service area is 73.2% (e21); therefore, the proposed program will provide nutrition services (e22).

In view of the eligible services, the application connects the results of its George Washington 2008 FSCS grant to the ask of the current application. In 2008, the applicant won the FSCS grant and has learned lessons working as a Community School with Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis (e14). These lessons contribute to the applicant's Full Service Community School knowledge so that it may build on prior work. It is evident that the applicant would like to build on work that has been completed before (e18). Page e18 includes a chart in which the application provides information on prior work that has been completed using a 2008 US DOE FSCS grant. For example, according to the application, the student attendance rate increased by over 6%. Furthermore, the 2008 FSCS grant contributed to an increase in high school graduation rates according to the application (e18).

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not state that the absolute priority is to establish a FSCS.

The plan for project potential beyond the end of the grant is very limited. (pages e22-e23). The details on how the program would continue to operate are missing. The applicant states that additional streams of funding will be sought after the grant ends; however, programmatic implementation details were not provided. The scheduling information in this section does not support potential beyond the grant. In this section, the applicant states that students will enroll in a program that starts at 6 or 7 PM; therefore, this type of information does not contribute to project potential beyond the end of the grant (e22-e23).

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.

The adequacy of resources plan is fully developed. Page e24-e28 contains a thorough list of the support for this work. The applicant seems to have adequate equipment, supplies, and other resources from the large number of consortium partners. The applicant's itemization of what each partner will contribute is particularly convincing. For example, the George Washington Community School & IPS will provide facilities, equipment, materials, and snacks. Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis will provide assistance with college preparatory programs and provide tutoring. United Way of Central Indiana will provide community engagement support. La Plaza will assist with Latino retention initiatives. Learning Well will provide a no-charge teen health clinic (e25-e27). These are all examples that indicate this applicant has adequate resources.

Based on the information provided, the applicant's partners seem to be experts in providing the

services that the applicant needs them to provide (e28-e29). The fact that the partners actively participated in the proposal development shows commitment. If the partners are willing to invest time now when there is no award, it is likely that they will invest time if the award is actually received. The Memorandum of Understanding documents in the application appendix (e70-e104) seem to support the commitment of the partners. Furthermore, the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) documents specify the commitment that each partner has made as stated in the actual application narrative. The MOUs clearly state what is expected of each applicant. For example, the MOU with the Christamore House states that this partner will provide youth programming through STEM activities. (e72-73). Another example is located on pages e76-e77 with the Center for Urban & Multicultural Education MOU. This MOU clearly states that an expert will develop evaluation instruments for Indianapolis Near Westside Community Schools Initiative.

The application provides sound information that the costs are reasonable. The per person yearly costs seem reasonable. The applicant seems to have a good understanding of the funds needed for this ask. Serving 70% of the student enrollment would cost \$195. This seems like a modest cost to provide wrap around services that have been demonstrated to improve academic and other socio-economic factors.

Weaknesses:

There are no noted weaknesses.

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 quality of the management plan is sound. The applicant describes other grants that it has managed which justifies its ability to manage this grant. For example, the applicant has won a US DOE 21st Century Community Learning Centers grant along with the following other grants: Social Innovation Fund, the State Early Intervention Reading grant, the huge regional National Community Service AmeriCorps grant, USA Funds, the US HUD, etc (e31). The applicant's mention of various ratings and audit results also support its credibility in managing this award. For example it has achieved the national charitable standards of the BBB (e31). The applicant provides comprehensive details on logistics. For example, on page e32, the applicant states that GWCS will be the hub of the entire Near Westside with the 3 community centers. Furthermore, the applicant seems to have the management logistics of this work planned as the roles of individuals and committees, such as the Westside Community Advisory Committee, has already been planned (e31-e33).

The qualifications of relevant personnel seem essential and the applicant makes a convincing case that the personnel are well qualified to plan, coordinate, and manage this type of work. The applicant identifies critical programmatic roles (i.e. program manager), as well as critical non-programmatic roles (i.e. finance assistant) (e40-e42). Based on the resumes of key personnel found in appendix A, the key personnel have the expertise to coordinate and manage this work (e54- e56).

The applicant states that the key personnel will work on this project full-time. This type of work will require a great deal of management. This seems appropriate because the work has five core tenets which are access, accommodations, atmosphere, achievement, and accountability. Each of these tenets requires a significant amount of management, coordination and planning; therefore, full time commitments are needed for this work. For example a full-time GWCS will oversee daily operations, coordinate with teachers, providers, etc., establish the organization structure, maintain a project website, supervise volunteers, complete reports and work with the elementary coordinators along with the external evaluation team.

Weaknesses:

There are no noted weaknesses.

Question Status: Completed

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 quality of project services is fully developed. The applicant provides some research that supports the proposed project. The research demonstrating that behavior is directly linked to academic achievement supports the various mental and emotional health initiatives that this applicant proposes providing. The recent research citation (CSC, Making the Difference, 2006; Houser, 2014) states that community schools significantly improve student achievement while decreasing suspensions/expulsions. Furthermore the applicant also states that Research has consistently showed students labeled disruptive score lower academically, are less likely to participate in school activities, and are more likely to fail or drop out (Barr, Robert, 2001; Houser, 2010)This solidifies the need for this service.

The application demonstrates an understanding of the importance of academic preparation and academic trajectory. This information is evidence that the applicant has experience with this type of work and that the applicant has an idea of what may actually lead to improvements in achievement and what will not. Furthermore, GWCS traditionally has had a high percentage of students who use the services and the applicant will continue to emphasize it through teachers, staff, counselors, and service providers (e43).

Weaknesses:

(The applicant cites a few studies in a rather inadequate manner. Since the application provides such compelling information on the nature of the problem in the service area, more research that connects effective practice to the proposed community served would strengthen this proposal. The application states that the GWCS Model will be implemented in 4 feeder Westside elementary schools. Qualitative research that connects the GWCS Model to intended outcomes is missing (e42-e43).

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.

The project evaluation plan is thorough. Furthermore, an external evaluation party is conducting the work (e44). An appropriate combination of quantitative and qualitative methods will be used to collect data (e44-e47). Pre-test scores, post-test scores, focus groups, and interviews will all be used to gather necessary data. Multiple observations, extensive reviews of non-school hour programs, community-based assessments, and interviews with staff members will also be used. Usage statistics will also be collected and this is important because these types of data can improve program efficiency by eliminating what is not useful for the service population.

The application presents an extensive list of the performance data that will be used in this project on pages e48-e50. The performance measurements are specific, measurable, and time-bound. Metrics such as graduation rates, I-STEP scores, and parental participation all seem like relevant metrics for this work.

Weaknesses:

The strategies for replicating or testing the project intervention in multiple settings are vague. The application provides information about how the validity of this work will be tested through experimental design but this does not address implementing this intervention in other settings (e47-e48).

If the applicant listed specific desired percentile movements on the ISTEP, the application would be even stronger. For example, having a goal to move students from the 7th to the 10th

percentile would be a more specific ISTEP goal.

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

No Promise Zone noted.

Weaknesses

No Promise Zone noted.

Question Status: Completed

Reviewer Score: 0

Technical Review Cover Sheet

Panel Details

Fiscal Year 2014

CFDA/Subprogram 84.215J **Schedule** 1 **Tier** 1

No

No.

Panel Name Full Service Community
Schools – 2

Applicant Name Mary Rigg Neighborhood Center **PR/Award No** U215J140075

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
<hr/>		
TOTAL	100	94

Priority Questions

1. Competitive Preference Priority: Promise Zones

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

TOTAL	3	0
<hr/>		
GRAND TOTAL	103	94

Technical Review Form

Applicant Name Mary Rigg Neighborhood Center **PR/Award No** U215J140075

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

This proposal supports the Full Service Community Schools concept by establishing a program in Indiana. This project takes a comprehensive community approach in addressing many of the social problems that plague an inner city neighborhood in Indianapolis, Indiana. The targeted neighborhood has a high crime rate and a demographic complexity that requires a collaborative approach to successfully correct the many negative influences that families endure on a daily basis. This project clearly identifies the problems of the area to be served by listing statistics on the crime rate (pages 1-2), detailed information on the ethnicity of the service area, and the dire need for the project. The project will serve approximately 10,000 individuals at an average cost of \$47 per person served per year (page 15) over the five year period of the program. The initiatives listed in the project have a history of success since this project is a continuation of a previously awarded grant from 2008 (page 3).

The project outlines in detail its 5 year plan to serve students and families by combining the resources of the more than 17 agencies that have signed memorandums of understanding (page 17) in support of the program. Specifically, the project will combine educational and social services programs in an effort to improve the entire community through collaborative pre-school through adult education programs. These services will include mental health counseling, nutritional services, service learning projects, and career preparation (pages 21-22). Students will gain self esteem and parents will receive parenting advice and training as a result of this project. In turn, the schools system will benefit by having better prepared students who have an increased sense of pride in their community and a desire to strive for a better life.

Weaknesses

While this proposal is very comprehensive, it does not identify detailed interim goals with corrective action steps in the event that progress is compromised. Although on page 32 the application states that, "semester feedback and end-of-year reports will be provided," expected interim targets were not identified. The lack of interim goals will inhibit the technical service providers from providing timely assistance and guidance in implementing community school initiative services in the targeted area schools (page 32).

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

This project identifies the many organizations that have collaboratively committed to this project. It clearly outlines in detail the specific commitments and responsibilities of the more than 17 entities that are the anchors of the project (pages 11-12). The extensive list of agency commitments is reasonable in scope as evidenced by the signing of MOUs and should generate the desired results. The project includes detailed examples of an organizational structure that allows for each organization to work within the boundaries of their expertise, while maintaining central control by establishing a Community Advisory Council (page 4) to work with the Proposal Development Team to provide oversight. The budget requests reflect shared financial commitments with clear financial expertise in efficiently utilizing other funding sources to support initiatives without violating the principal of supplanting other funds.

Weaknesses

No evident weaknesses.

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

This project was developed by a Proposal Development Team (PDT) that met for more than one year to develop a comprehensive management design (page 15). Representatives from a local university anchored the development of the plan to make certain the design was evidence driven and to ensure that the project utilized the expertise of each partner. The PDT selected an established agency, the Mary Rigg Neighborhood Center, as the fiscal agent because of their established reputation in successfully facilitating the application of services, while establishing and maintaining a stellar financial reputation. Mary Rigg Neighborhood Center in turn established regional support centers, such as the George Washington Community School (page 17), to facilitate the provision of services as close as possible to where the families live. This was a great decision in that it allowed parents to be actively involved without having to travel for meetings. These centers will be organized as hubs for the community, complete with anchor services and a centralized family gathering area in the center. In addition, the four feeder elementary schools will serve as “anchors” in their respective areas. This model will contribute to a continuum of services between elementary and middle schools.

Weaknesses

No evident weaknesses.

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

This project applies scientifically based research approaches to addressing the community needs of Indianapolis. In the needs assessment, the applicant identified diminishing support of public education based upon the changing demographics and the urgent need to rebuild the community. The high school dropout rate is a staggering 60-70% (page 27) which has contributed to a high crime rate and very low student morale. Adolescent and young adult deviant behavior is widespread in the community reflecting characteristics found in similar communities with at-risk populations. The stated activities in this project will provide programs and services such as extended school day and extended school year programs to address academic issues and offer students safe havens afterschool and during non-mandatory school attendance days. During this extended learning time, students will be offered academic tutoring, computerized instruction, and enrichment activities that will improve their academic performance on standardized tests.

Weaknesses

Although the project discusses and cites the use of research in the application, the proposal does not give specific examples of successful strategies for all of the community member entities. For example, service learning is listed on page 21 as an example of an effective strategy. The section states, "special training will be provided on service learning to prevent homelessness." The section does not cite any research to support this claim. Another example of this occurs in the very next section that covers job/career training and counseling. Again, there are no references to research to justify the claims that this training will lead to the development of career ready skills.

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

This project takes a traditional, but sound approach to evaluating its effectiveness. By partnering with Indiana University Purdue University Indiana (IUPUI), the project secured the services of a “highly qualified and experienced researcher” (page 29) who has a solid reputation. The evaluation of the project will include formative and summative data derived from surveys, self-assessments, and student academic information. These data will be collected and analyzed using a data management software program called NVIVO©. The timeframe for analyzing this data will be at the end of each academic semester and the end of each school year (page 32).

Weaknesses

The project does not detail information on how the many agencies will be evaluated for their effectiveness on an interim and end result basis. With more than 17 organizations participating in this project, a more detailed interim system for evaluating the effectiveness of each agency would strengthen this proposal. An interim system would provide “dashboard indicators” that could identify short term problems before they become major setbacks.

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

This application does not indicate that it will serve a federally designated Promise Zone community.

Weaknesses

This application does not indicate that it will serve a federally designated Promise Zone community.

Question Status: Completed

Reviewer Score: 0