

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 - 8

Applicant Name New London Public Schools **PR/Award No** U215J140070

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	6
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 New London Public Schools **PR/Award No** U215J140070

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 does a good job describing project services and highlighting the community and school demographics. The proposed project will serve a student population where over 87% of students qualify for free or reduced lunch; 27% are Limited English Proficient (LEP); and 16% have been identified as in need of special education services (p.1). The profile of the community paints a bleaker picture with a high percentage (17%) of adults 25 years or older with less than a high school diploma; a high unemployment rate of 11.8%; high crime rates that range from 4%-45%; and high levels of marijuana use (40%) by 8th grade students (p.2-4).

The applicant has identified a number of strategies for addressing the range of challenges. Some of the eligible services that meet the absolute priority include extended learning, rotary, leadership, and a Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math (STEM) curriculum based on a marine science curriculum (p.5). Some of the programs are currently being implemented and the integration of these programs into the proposed project design is a good way to leverage existing federal and state funding sources such as Title 1 and 21st Century Learning; and through their community partnerships (p.7-11 & appendices).

Weaknesses:

The applicant fails to provide details on how they will select students and parents for the program. The applicant has identified a number of programs and how participants will be selected for the various programs is needed to determine how the over 500 students will be served (p.3, 5).

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 does a good job of identifying the resources that will be committed to the project that include significant in-kind services from community partners. Three of the community partners will provide over \$159,000 a year in educational programming. In addition, the applicant identifies a number of facilities that will be leveraged (e.g., field trips, use of regional, state, and national parks) and programs that will be provided afterschool and during the summer (p.17, 20).

The applicant provides detailed MOUs that document the commitment of each partner, roles, responsibilities, experience, and capacity to support the proposed project objectives. The partners all have expertise in areas that have been identified for services (e.g., STEM) and will provide representation on the advisory board. All costs are appropriate and reasonable in relation to the number of persons to be served and services to be provided demonstrating a strong commitment to the project (p.23-25, appendices).

Weaknesses:

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.

Strengths:

The applicant provides a comprehensive plan that documents the planning, coordination, and management of the project. The proposed project design is built off of existing relationships as evidenced by the strong partnership statements in the MOUs (see appendices). The applicant and many of the partners have a history of working together (p.22-25) and will use lessons learned to achieve the stated outcomes.

The training, experience, and time commitments are appropriate in meeting project objectives. There is a comprehensive plan for coordination amongst each of the partner entities as evidenced by detailed timeline and milestones document (p.25-27). The Project Implementation Team will consist of a number of key personnel who will assist the Project Director and FSCS Coordinator in monitoring goals and objectives. The time commitments of all staff members are adequate to meet objectives (p.28, appendices).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

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 has identified a number of program activities that are based on research and effective practice (Communities in School, Extended Learning) that have been identified as programs that have shown some increases in the achievement level of students when measured against rigorous academic standards (p.29-32). For example, the applicant cites two programs in California that resulted in 9 out of 10 students improving English grades by at least one point (p.31).

Weaknesses:

While the applicant provides a significant amount of information on research, it is not clear if this is up-to-date knowledge as no dates are provided (p.29-32) to determine the likelihood of improvement based on the proposed program design.

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 will hire an external evaluator with previous experience evaluating federal grants to assist the FSCS Coordinator in the collection of data and analysis that will be shared with the Project Implementation Team (PIT) who will meet with the advisory council quarterly to discuss progress in meeting program objectives (p.32-33). The applicant indicates that qualitative and quantitative data will be collected that will be shared with project participants and parents at quarterly ice-cream socials (p.33).

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not provide for a thorough evaluation as the overall strategies for replication lacks specificity. The details on how the applicant will utilize the proposed evaluation model to provide data on relevant outcomes is not clearly described. It appears that the evaluator will be responsible for determining assessments and timelines for each outcome, with no clear description if the project team will be involved in the initial planning with the evaluator (p.33-34).

Question Status: Completed

Reviewer Score: 6

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 strengths noted.

Weaknesses

Applicant does not address this competitive preference priority, as the target area is not one of the five Promise Zone Designees.

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 - 8

Applicant Name New London Public Schools **PR/Award No** U215J140070

Questions

	Points Possible	Points Scored
1. Selection Criteria		
Project Design	25	21
Adequacy of Resources	20	20
Management Plan	25	25
Project Services	20	18
Project Evaluation	10	7
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 New London Public Schools **PR/Award No** U215J140070

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 provides an adequate description of target area students, families and communities. The inclusion of demographic (86% minority), poverty (87% qualify for free or reduce priced meals), ELL (27%), unemployment (11.8%) and adult educational attainment (17% do not have a high school diploma) data provide a comprehensive description of the target area and its residents (p1-2). Of particular strength is the inclusion of socio-economic statistics that establish the severity of need in the community. For instance, a high rate of violent crime, abuse and neglect, and alienation in the community and homes indicates that students are challenged both in the classroom and at home (p2). The applicant clearly states that the project will serve all students in the target school (n=561).

ii-The applicant provides a comprehensive overview of services and programs slated for this project. A strength of the application is that each service is linked with a gap identified by the application (p4-15). For students selected for participation, the frequency of services and variety of programming is appropriate (p5-7).

iii-A strength of the application is the alignment of project activities with the school improvement plan (SIP) in that it addresses student engagement, professional development and school connectedness (p15-16). The implementation of SIP "next steps" through this project's direct services to students is logical, increases the likelihood of sustainability, and ensures that programming represents a comprehensive approach to addressing underperformance (p16).

iv-The applicant provides evidence that the project will leverage existing programs and funding to accomplish the goals of this project. Connecticut College's Leadership Program, Coast Guard programming and New England Science program will provide funding, personnel and resources to support project initiatives (budget; p5).

Weaknesses:

i-No weaknesses noted.

ii-The applicant does not clearly indicate how students will access programming, especially the programming that is linked to academic performance. It is not clear how students will be selected, given that most programs have a participation target and school enrollment (n=561) exceeds participation targets (e.g., NESS program, 100 students; Extended learning, 126

students; REACH, 216 students) (p1, 5-7). The lack of a defined process (i.e., referral, application) to ensure that all students have an equal opportunity to participate in programming weakens this section of the narrative. The applicant also intends to impact historic student underperformance by afterschool participation in various short-term STEM experiences (p5-7). While inclusion of STEM programming is commendable, the narrative does not clearly indicate that these programs are aligned with state standards. There is also no clear evidence that these programs have a history of impacting math/science/reading/writing performance (p5-7). More detail is needed. Finally, the project utilizes several programs that are currently being offered, but does not clearly discuss why previous funding is no longer available and grant funding is needed. The discussion regarding stagnate funding is not clearly connected to project programming and does not provide needed context for the use of grant funds for current programming (p3).

iii-No weaknesses noted.

iv- No weaknesses noted.

Question Status: Completed

Reviewer Score: 21

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 provides adequate support for the number of students served and the intended

project services. The use of a full-time coordinator, school/district/partner facilities and in-kind donations of services and personnel provide ample evidence of an appropriate level of partner-provided resources for the project (p19-20).

ii-Each partner has signed a MOU that details their history in providing targeted services and specific roles and responsibilities under the project. Beyond providing services, each partner will provide a representative for the project advisory committee (p21). All services noted on the MOU in the appendix are referenced in the narrative for each project partner.

iii-The budget clearly delineates anticipated project costs. The amounts noted are reasonable for a project serving one site and a maximum of 561 students (p1). The budget is annotated and clearly discusses how costs were calculated and what services they will cover. This is a strength of the proposal.

Weaknesses:

i-No weaknesses noted.

ii-No weaknesses noted.

iii-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.

Strengths:

i-The applicant's use of a planning team, with various district and grant personnel, and a project advisory committee, with parent and partner representatives is evidence of best practice. The inclusion of multiple voices at various stages of project development increases the likelihood that the project will represent all key stakeholders (p24-25). The inclusion of a structured timeline with project activities and milestones will also likely ensure that project personnel are informed and held accountable for assigned duties (p25-27). The duties of the principal, project coordinator, parent educator and advisory council are clearly delineated and will likely facilitate project implementation.

ii-The coordinator has not been hired, but the job description outlines required skills and duties that reflect project activities and goals. The candidate must have a bachelor's degree and experience differentiating instruction and working in a multi-cultural/multi-racial district (appendix). The principal also has qualifications aligned with the project in that she was the district data facilitator, served on the district teaching and learning team and has been the principal for the last four years (appendix).

iii-The time commitment of the FSCS coordinator (1FTE), parent education coordinator (.5FTE), and principal (.15FTE) are appropriate given the activities proposed for the project. A strength of the proposal is that a Parent Education Coordinator position is included that will ensure parental involvement efforts are implemented as outlined in the grant (p28).

Weaknesses:

i-No weaknesses noted.

ii-No weaknesses noted.

iii-No weaknesses noted.

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:

i-The applicant justifies that project components have merit in the field by providing summaries of similar programs and program outcomes like Communities in Schools (p29-31). There is also ample evidence in the discourse that extended learning/out-of-school time, coordinated delivery of services, and involvement of parents are examples of best practice strategies for student support. The integration of strategies from the school improvement plan is also a best practice to ensure that project services are coordinated.

ii-The narrative provides summaries of STEM and extended learning programs that support the broad use of the intervention type (p31-32). Support for the intervention-type indicates that the models suggested for this project may have similar results.

Weaknesses:

i-The applicant does not provide reference dates for three of the four best practice strategies provided as support for the project (p29-31). Date and citation references strengthen the narrative by validating conclusions as research findings and not opinions.

ii-The applicant uses findings from studies on other programs not referenced in this proposal as evidence that the project's global strategy is effective. In that most programs are currently being offered in the school, achievement data from those programs may have provided more convincing support that the continuation of these programs will lead to improvements in 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:

i-The project's use of monthly implementation team and quarterly advisory team meetings will likely ensure that stakeholders are aware of project progress (p32-33). The inclusion of multiple voices and defined duties for each group also creates a structure in which daily and programmatic issues can be addressed in a timely manner. The use of a full-time coordinator is also a best practice for a project that engages multiple external partners for delivery of services.

ii-The applicant provides a viable strategy for replication in that the evaluation report will include specific language that highlights successful and challenging components and address replication/testing (p34). This language will likely facilitate sustainability in that evaluation efforts will forecast and suggest modification of services that encourage continuation of services rather than just report on project progress.

iii-The narrative contains quantified benchmarks for performance in student achievement areas (p34-35). The inclusion of numeric benchmarks will hold stakeholders accountable for progress in student achievement and assist project staff in determining interim adjustments to services or activities.

Weaknesses:

i-No weaknesses noted.

ii-No weaknesses noted.

iii-The applicant does not include performance measures that specifically report on the success of each intervention used in the project (p34-35). Whereas achievement in math may be attributable to many factors, a specific indicator on the interventions may provide data on their

unique effectiveness in improving achievement. The absence of this data limits the project's ability to gauge intervention effectiveness.

Question Status: Completed

Reviewer Score: 7

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 strengths noted

Weaknesses

Applicant does not address this competitive preference priority, as the target area is not one of the five Promise Zone Designees.

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 - 8

Applicant Name New London Public Schools **PR/Award No** U215J140070

Questions

	Points Possible	Points Scored
1. Selection Criteria		
Project Design	25	23
Adequacy of Resources	20	20
Management Plan	25	25
Project Services	20	19
Project Evaluation	10	8
TOTAL	100	95

Priority Questions

1. Competitive Preference Priority: Promise Zones

CPP: Promise Zones	3	0
<hr/>		
TOTAL	3	0
<hr/>		
GRAND TOTAL	103	95

Technical Review Form

Applicant Name New London Public Schools **PR/Award No** U215J140070

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:

*All aspects of the proposal were presented clearly. Each area was delineated with the necessary specifics. The statistical information provided outlining violent crime, unemployment, lack of education, and the basic need for food in New London made a persuasive case for the project. (pp. 1-3)

*The groundwork necessary for this ambitious project to succeed is already laid. The proposal explained what was in place, what would be expanded, and what was ready to move forward should it be funded . The New London Public Schools has had “flat funding” for the past 5 years. (p.3) The proposal seeks funding to augment stagnant state and district funds. New London Public School district has been designated by the CT Dept. of Education as being the “district with the highest levels of student need.”

*The partners involved have a notable record of success in serving the community as a whole. Additionally, the activities for students were creative and not your ordinary field trips. Such activities as outlined would be new and engaging for students from the schools involved.

*The need for this project is persuasively presented with statistical information and examples.

*Acknowledgement of the "gaps" in the current situation involving insufficiently intense academic program, lack of student engagement, and lack of parental engagement were bluntly laid out without excuses for the school involved. This, when coupled with the proposed ways to meet the needs and fill the gaps identified, demonstrated a thoroughness of thought and commitment.

*Every part of the proposal was well written. This culminated in a sense of confidence that Project Connect would be successful and meet the goals outlined for each year.

Weaknesses

It was not clear if the portfolios referenced (p. 18) were to be electronic or paper.

The target group for this project is 6-8th grade students., and the Teens in Action program will work with these students. It was confusing considering the target group age range, and the description (p 23) of TIA as providing support to achieve HS graduation and employment. m. It was unclear whether their program would be adapted for younger students.

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 strength of the contributions of the individual partners was presented effectively as was their previous programmatic successes in working with students and families.

*Page 19 asserts that the project has a "robust coordination of high quality, highly coordinated, local partnerships" that will be used to provide "students with extensive services and enrichment in a cost-efficient, feasible way." Again, this shows a thoroughness of thought on the part of the project managers to use what is in place and build upon it.

*The project managers have leveraged the potential success of the project to achieve 50% matches from the Leadership Program at Connecticut College, the US Coast Guard Academy's Reach STEM and the afterschool NESS program of the New England Science and Sailing.

*The comparison of incarceration statistics and associated costs to what would be achieved to off-set these problems through the grant proposal was a very compelling and exceptional use of hard evidence.

Weaknesses:

*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.

Strengths:

*The comprehensive management plan was clear and addressed what was already in place and who needed to be hired with project funding.

*A notable strength was the inclusion of the two job descriptions to be used for the Full Service Community School Coordinator and the Parent Educator Coordinator. The project managers are ready to move quickly to get Project Connect up to full speed as soon as funding is awarded.

*They have done a great deal of planning to date, and will not need to spend one or two quarters of time engaged in organizational work with the partners, or the programs they hope to initiate. That has already been done as evidenced by the Project Connect Timeline/Milestones (p. 25).

Weaknesses: No weaknesses noted.

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:

*Citations used within the proposal reflect a strong professional engagement with current practices and research. (e27, 29,31,37-38, 43-46)

*While an outside evaluator will be used to develop assessments and analyze data, a great deal of the assessment will be achieved through weekly and monthly meetings of the project team. Reports on every aspect of work with the partners will be continual and consistent. Needed adjustments will be made in a timely manner.

*A schedule of reviewing data collected has already been established.

*Attention has been given to ensuring that workshops for parents will be offered bilingually. These include dissemination of health, academic, and parenting skills.

*All aspects of encouraging engagement, providing information and necessary materials have been taken into consideration. Notably, there is a budget line item to purchase camping clothing and supplies to be loaned to students who would not have such things. This allows EVERY student to participate in the activities planned.

Weaknesses:

No date references included with citation of research. This was seen as a minor concern.

Question Status: Completed

Reviewer Score: 19

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:

*While an outside evaluator will be used develop assessments and analyze data, a great deal of the assessment will be achieved through weekly and monthly meetings of the project team. Reports on every aspect of work with the partners will be continual and consistent. Adjustments when needed will be made in a timely manner.

*A schedule to review data collected has already been established. Measurable outcomes and how reliable performance data will be gather is outlined on pp. 34-35. This covers the 5 year plan of the grant.

*The day-to-day, week-to-week evaluation of the project rests in the hands of the project managers and team. Their qualifications are such that evaluations will be handled properly.

*The outside evaluator will be responsible for the statistical data and reporting.

Weaknesses:

The qualifications/experiences of the individuals now involved might have been highlighted to a greater extent.

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 strengths noted.

Weaknesses

Applicant does not address this competitive preference priority, as the target area is not one of the five Promise Zone Designees.

Question Status: Completed

Reviewer Score: 0