Technical Review Cover Sheet

Panel Details

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

Panel   Full Service Community
Name   Schools - 11

Applicant Name   West Chicago Elementary School District 33   **PR/Award No**   U215J140025

Questions

	Points Possible	**Points Scored**
1. Selection Criteria		
Project Design	25	21
Adequacy of Resources	20	20
Management Plan	25	23
Project Services	20	18
Project Evaluation	10	9
TOTAL	**100**	**91**

Priority Questions

1. Competitive Preference Priority: Promise Zones

CPP: Promise Zones	3	0
TOTAL	**3**	**0**
GRAND TOTAL	**103**	**91**

Technical Review Form

Applicant Name   West Chicago Elementary School District 33   **PR/Award No**   U215J140025

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 proposal includes several goals and measurable outcomes such as increasing achievement on math and reading learning outcomes, improving student and family health, and enhancing parent engagement (pg. 2).

The project scope is comprehensive and will include 11 of the FSCS services listed in the grant announcement (pg. 8).

The proposal provides a detailed background on the students to be served, the needs of the region and population, and how these factors contribute to barriers to educational achievement among the target population (pg. 5).

Weaknesses:

The application could be strengthened by including more information about the sustainability plans beyond the grant with support from partners (pg. 16). The grant should also describe why certain service models were selected and how the models are informed by best practices and research (pg. 10).

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:

The project will be supported by facilities including office space, a library, a computer room, classrooms, equipment and supplies (pg. 17). The partners will provide services such as dental care, nutrition workshops, interns, and healthcare screenings (pg. 17). The lead applicant is foregoing supervisory and indirect costs associate with the grant (pg. 17).

Weaknesses:

None 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 staffing plan identifies a supervisor and likely candidates for FSCS coordinator position. The staffing plan includes an after-school coordinator, a mental health clinician, and an ESL coordinator (pg. 20).

The leadership team will meet monthly and the advisory team will meet quarterly (pg. 20).

The management plan also includes a detailed implementation plan with benchmarks, objectives and indicators, activities, staff assignments, and timeline (pg. 23).

Weaknesses:

The application could be strengthened by including the amount of time staff members will dedicate to the project (pg. 20).

Question Status: Completed

Reviewer Score: 23

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 grant provides good detail around the project's eleven services and the population to be served (pgs. 8-10). The FSCS projects consists of three interconnected systems including instructional supports, enrichment activities, heath, and mental health services (pg. 28). The Dryfoos model and FSCS Replication Model provide the theoretical framework for the model to

support the likelihood that the services will lead to student achievement and overall improved health (pg. 27).

Weaknesses:

The application could be improved by including baseline data, goals and expected improvements (pgs. 8-10).

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 evaluation plan includes both formative evaluation to review process and product data, and a summative evaluation at regular intervals during the grant (pg. 30).

   The evaluation plan is a multi-methods approach consisting of interviews, surveys, archival data, questionnaires and focus groups (pg. 29).

   The evaluation coordinator will observe project activities and participate in on-site visits to collect data and perform focus groups (pg. 30), allowing the evaluator to become familiar with the daily operations of the project.

   Weaknesses:

The application could be strengthened by describing the plan for reviewing the data to be collected and how it will be used to improve services or interventions (pg. 30).

Question Status: Completed

Reviewer Score: 9

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 the criterion.

Weaknesses

The applicant did not address the criterion.

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 – 11

Applicant Name   West Chicago Elementary School District 33   **PR/Award No**   U215J140025

Questions

	Points Possible	Points Scored
1. Selection Criteria		
Project Design	25	24
Adequacy of Resources	20	20
Management Plan	25	23
Project Services	20	16
Project Evaluation	10	9
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   West Chicago Elementary School District 33   **PR/Award No**   U215J140025

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:

1. The application does a great job of establishing goals and identifying the measures of success that will be used to assess the project's progress on goals. Examples such as standardized test scores, MAP scores, and student activity are excellent outcome and output measurements that demonstrate the potential for the projects.

2. The description of the student population use data to describe the needs and challenges that students and families in the community face. These demographics include poverty rates of English Language Learners, and student mobility, among others. In total, this addresses criterion 1 well.

3. Partners such as Glen Arbor Church, the West Chicago Public Library, College of DuPage, Northern Illinois Food Bank, Neighborhood Food Pantry, and KidCare Medical are examples of the existing partners who have committed or will commit support and resources to the project (mentoring, literacy, nutrition courses, health care) to demonstrate the extent to which partners will be integrated.

Weaknesses:

1. The applicant sites a partnership with United Way and the Live United Neighborhood network Model as a funding strategy to integrate funding streams, but does not provide enough detail explaining the planning or potential to sustain the work beyond the life of the grant.

Question Status: Completed

Reviewer Score: 24

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:

1. The Currier school facilities which includes a library, computer lab, art, office space for partners and a resource center are examples of resources committed to this project.

2. A list of partners and their commitments of student interns, professional development, health specialists, staff, programming, etc. were identified to demonstrate that partners are committing resources to the success of this project.

3. The applicant identifies the history of the partnerships working on the WGTK project which demonstrates stability and experience in coordinating services. The MOAs are excellent examples of committed resources and the commitments of each partner are both relevant and appropriate.

Weaknesses:

None 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:

Staff members are identified for each role and the applicant will establish a Leadership Team to support programming and coordination of services. The frequency at which this group will meet over the life of the grant is explained clearly to describe the oversight strategy.

Other teams such as the Advisory Team also have frequency clearly identified.

A timeline is provided to establish how the project will be ramped up, how planning will take place, and how programming will be implemented and coordinated with principals and partners.

Partner roles as service providers are explained in other parts of the grant.

Weaknesses:

The only item lacking without explicit explanation was the time commitments of the project director, FSCS coordinator and other key personnel.

Question Status: Completed

Reviewer Score: 23

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:

Overall, the application provided a strong description of services and explained the likelihood that the services would lead to improvements in academic achievement. Services are detailed and tied to goals and have explanations of timeline and implementation.

Weaknesses:

The explanation written in this specific section was not as strong as the information from other areas detailing the linkages. Points are awarded based on the strength of the other sections.

Additionally, more research and current knowledge of effective practices could have been added to tie into specific services of the project and the overall strategy of the project as a whole to bolster the application.

Question Status: Completed

Reviewer Score: 16

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

5. **(1) The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project.**

    (2) In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the extent to which the proposed evaluation:

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

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

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

Strengths:

The applicant lays a framework for formative and summative assessments using focus groups,

interviews, questionnaires and archival data. Metrics and processes are identified to assess the impact of the programming. A baseline is established to provide comparison information.

Clear explanations for sophisticated research and evaluation strategies are provided to link the evaluation efforts to the use of the data to inform practice. This section is a strength in the evaluation section of the application.

Weaknesses:

The proposal could have improved by providing a timeline on data collection, evaluation, and by stating how the data would be used to inform implementation. More explanation on the formative aspects of the evaluation would have bolstered the evaluation. The explanation of how the EC will interact with service providers and the data to be collected and presented was broad and did not provide enough information.

Question Status: Completed

Reviewer Score: 9

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 section.

Weaknesses

The applicant did not address this section.

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 - 11

Applicant Name   West Chicago Elementary School District 33   **PR/Award No**   U215J140025

Questions

	Points Possible	**Points Scored**
1. Selection Criteria		
Project Design	25	23
Adequacy of Resources	20	20
Management Plan	25	23
Project Services	20	20
Project Evaluation	10	10
TOTAL	**100**	**96**

Priority Questions

1. Competitive Preference Priority: Promise Zones

CPP: Promise Zones	3	0
TOTAL	**3**	**0**
GRAND TOTAL	**103**	**96**

Technical Review Form

Applicant Name   West Chicago Elementary School District 33   **PR/Award No**   U215J140025

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 a strong argument for the need of the Full Service Community grant. There were (4) areas identified to build the case for securing this grant. In discussing the risk for academic failure, low-income status, ESL and limited parental education, a lack of access to health and mental care and a challenging social environment were the core issues discussed in great detail (see pgs. 6-8). The applicant outlined (11) services to be provided to the community. These services are discussed comprehensively on (pgs. 8-16), in the context of the needs of the community and the frequency with which these services will be provided to the community. In illustrating an example on (p. 16), the applicant states, "ESL classes will be run by Literacy DuPage, twice a week for 2 hours…."

WEAKNESSES

Although the applicant discussed on (p. 16) how this project will integrate and/or build on related efforts, the information provided was too general. The applicant states on (p. 16), "The FSCS project will benefit from local district funds, Title I, and Title III,,,," It would have been helpful to understand the specifics of these funding sources, and how these funding sources are limited, hence, the inability to improve relevant outcomes without this grant.

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's adequacy of support and demonstrated commitment of each partner is exceptional. The applicant on (p. 17), list the resources available which is extensive and the partners commitment to this project is evidenced by signed memorandums of understandings. The list of partners is extensive, (see, p. 17-19). Finally, on (p. 20) the applicant documents the frequency of services, students/families, and determines an average cost per year for each of the five years of this grant. The average cost is more than reasonable given the number of services, students and families that will be part of this initiative.

WEAKNESSES

There were no weaknesses identified. This was criterion was fully discussed with all peer-reviewers.

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's management plan begins on (p. 20 through 27). The outline of the applicant's management plan is well-structured, consisting of a table outlining the planning period and implementation plan. The applicant provided detailed information related to the time commitments of the key members of the management team.

WEAKNESSES

The only item missing in the management plan is the time commitments of key members of staff that are part of the team.

Question Status: Completed

Reviewer Score: 23

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's overall strategy for fulfilling the Full-Service Community initiative is primarily based on the work of Dryfoos (2005) and Milton S. Eisenhower Foundation Full-Service Community Schools Replication Initiative. Both of these models for improving learning

outcomes reflect up-to-date research in the field of social science. On (p. 28), the applicant discusses how, "The likelihood that the services to be provided by the proposed project will lead to improvements in the achievement of students as measured against rigorous academic standards." The applicant will use state standards to assess the effectiveness of this initiative.

WEAKNESSES

As related to, "The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project reflect up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice;" the applicant's discussion was limited and too general in connecting the linkage of these services to the research cited.

Question Status: Completed

Reviewer Score: 20

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 in discussing timely and valid information on the management, implementation states on (p. 29), "Data collection and surveillance will be continuous, but will be reported…monthly." Throughout discussing the project evaluation, the applicant provided very specific details in this manner. The applicant's evaluation plan includes inferential statistics, such as analysis of variance and logistic regression which will allow for valid and reliable performance data on the relevant outcomes discussed.

WEAKNESSES

The applicant provides some information related to providing timely and valid information on the management and implementation of the project, but failed to show how the data will be used to improve the project. A well-planned and conducted formative evaluation is very important to ensure the fidelity of the project.

Question Status: Completed

Reviewer Score: 10

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority: Promise Zones - Promise Zones

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

Strengths

N/A

Weaknesses

The applicant did not address this criterion.

Question Status: Completed

Reviewer Score: 0