

**U.S. Department of Education - EDCAPS  
G5-Technical Review Form (New)**

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/22/2014 09:12 AM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Take Stock in Children, Inc. (U411C140021)

Reader #2: \*\*\*\*\*

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Summary Statement</b>		
<b>Summary Statement</b>		
1. Summary Statement	0	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	0	0
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	35	35
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	30	27
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan/Personnel	20	18
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	15	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	80
<b>Total</b>	100	80

# Technical Review Form

Panel #4 - 2014 Development Full Panels - 4: 84.411C

Reader #2: \*\*\*\*\*

Applicant: Take Stock in Children, Inc. (U411C140021)

## Questions

### Summary Statement - Summary Statement

#### 1. Summary Statement (Optional)

##### General:

The applicant proposes to address Absolute Priority 2 relative to Improving Low Performing Schools.

Reader's Score: 0

### Selection Criteria - Significance

#### 1. In determining the significance of the project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project addresses the absolute priority the applicant is seeking to meet.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project would implement a novel approach as compared with what has been previously attempted nationally.

(3) The potential contribution of the proposed project to the development and advancement of theory, knowledge, and practices in the field of study.

**Note:** In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to explain how the applicant's proposed project addresses the absolute priority and the subpart that it seeks to meet. Additionally, the Secretary asks that applicants explain how the proposed project is unique. Applicants should explain how their proposed projects fit into existing theory, knowledge, or practice, and how their proposed projects will serve as exemplars for new practices in the field.

##### Strengths:

It is clearly evident that the proposed project addresses the absolute priority the applicant is seeking to meet. As indicated on page e53, the applicant and its respective partners will address Absolute Priority Two (Improving Low Performing Schools) via mentoring and advocacy with the intent of increasing student academic performance.

The applicant well demonstrates that its approach to addressing the intended absolute priority is novel. The approach is novel as it will involve the implementation of wrap-around support services including case management, academic and behavioral monitoring, advocacy, individualized interventions, in-school community-based mentoring, post-secondary preparation and transition services, and college scholarships that holds promise for having a positive impact on overall student achievement and success.

The potential contribution of the proposed project to the development and advancement of theory, knowledge, and practices in the field of study is sufficiently evident. The project has the potential to demonstrate statistically significant improvements in achievement and student beliefs about their own achievement based on its wrap-around mentoring approach. The applicant also proposes to utilize a school wide design to its mentoring approach. The knowledge and practices of the project has the potential to provide significant knowledge regarding the achievement of multiple ethnic groups at the same time. For example, the applicant proposes to maintain a balance of participation among different

ethnic groups among the target participants (Page e25).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score:** 35

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design**

**1. In determining the quality of the proposed project design, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

**(1) The clarity and coherence of the project goals, including the extent to which the proposed project articulates an explicit plan or actions to achieve its goals (e.g., a fully developed logic model of the proposed project).**

**(2) The clarity, completeness, and coherence of the project goals, and whether the application includes a description of project activities that constitute a complete plan for achieving those goals, including the identification of potential risks to project success and strategies to mitigate those risks.**

**Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to address what activities the applicant will undertake in its proposed project, and how the applicant will ensure its project implementation is successful in achieving the project goals.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant evidences two broad-based and robust goals that are clearly articulated. The goals along with explicit actions, are aligned with the absolute priority the applicant is seeking to address. On page e25 and e27, for example, the applicant's goals entail building strong evidence for improving students' non-cognitive skill sets to increase academic achievement and students' readiness for postsecondary education and employment and strengthening the case for adoption of a collective impact, whole-school mentoring approach as an effective vehicle to increase stakeholder engagement, promoting sustained improvements in low-performing schools. The applicant also evidences an exhaustive logic model that clearly aligns the resources, activities, outputs, outcomes and intended impact on the whole school, the classroom and the individual within the identified target group (Page e69).

The goals are coherent and are correlated with sound strategies that constitute a clear and complete plan that is intended to accomplish tasks necessary to meet the overall intent of the proposal and for accomplishing its identified goals (Pages e33 and e34). The goals also include measurable objectives that are clear, specific and concise and are directly aligned with specific outcomes of the intended proposal. The applicant also evidences specific activities that constitute a complete plan for achieving the goals of the proposal include the implementation of school wide mentoring, providing professional development to teachers and staff and individual student and parent program activities (Pages e27-e32)

The applicant clearly evidences six potential risk related to the success of the project. The applicant also evidences clear and concise strategies to mitigate each of the identified risks. One identified risk, for example, pertains to the challenge of recruiting mentors in the rural section of the target area. To mitigate this risk, the applicant proposes to utilize volunteer coordinators as well as utilize staff and students from institutions of higher education to lead mentoring groups whose specialties are aligned with the tenets of the proposal (Page e35).

**Weaknesses:**

As noted in the management plan on page e36, the applicant proposes three days of professional development for teachers and staff during the planning and development stage of the project's implementation. Three days of professional development is insufficient for a project of this magnitude.

## Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

### 1. In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the management plan articulates key responsibilities and well-defined objectives, including the timelines and milestones for completion of major project activities, the metrics that will be used to assess progress on an ongoing basis, and annual performance targets the applicant will use to monitor whether the project is achieving its goals.

(2) The extent of the demonstrated commitment of any key partners or evidence of broad support from stakeholders whose participation is critical to the project's long-term success.

(3) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.

(4) The extent to which the project director has experience managing projects of similar size and scope as the proposed project.

**Note:** In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to address how the project team will evaluate the success or challenges of the project and use that feedback to make improvements to the project, and the role of key partners and their impact on the long-term success of the project, and how the project director's prior experiences have prepared them for implementing the proposed project of this size and scope successfully.

#### **Strengths:**

Key responsibilities of project personnel are well demonstrated. The roles and responsibilities of identified staff to the project such as the comptroller project, communications/data specialist, evaluator, the collective impact coordinator and college success coaches are clearly delineated (Pages e35 and e36).

The applicant provided a clear and succinct management plan inclusive measurable objectives with specific outcomes, activities, timelines, deliverables and identified persons responsible for carrying out each activity (Pages e33-e37). One of the objectives, for example is to decrease student dropout rate by .3 percent each year in each program year.

In addition, the applicant evidences sound and relevant metrics that will be used to assess progress and annual performance targets the applicant will use to monitor whether the project is achieving its goals. As indicated by the proposal on pages e33 and e34, increase the average daily attendance rate, reduce the rate of office discipline referrals, increase student's ability to self-regulate their behavior, increase the percent of target students who self-report aspiring to continue their education beyond high school.

The applicant provides clear evidence that well demonstrates the commitment of its key partners and stakeholders whose commitment is critical to the long-term success of the project. As indicated by the time line on pages e37 and e38, for example, principals and district personnel of the target district were involved in the grant planning process and are committed to program implementation. Partnership support of the proposal also includes Big Brothers Big Sisters; City Year; Columbia Chamber of Commerce; Columbia Public Schools Foundation; Communities in Schools; Florida College System; Florida Department of Education; Florida Gateway College; Florida Prepaid College Foundation; Goodwill; Jacksonville Public Education Fund; State University System of Florida; and United Way. In addition, the proposal also evidences a Memorandum of Agreement and letters of support from its partnering organizations that specifically outlines the support the partners will provide to the project (Pages e46-e51).

It is clearly evident that the project director has experience in managing projects of similar size and scope as the proposed project. As indicated by the resume on page e99, for example, the project director has over 25 years of extensive experience in the areas of education, fundraising, sales and marketing, program management. The identified person also has experience serving as Project Director for a multi-year, \$6.3 million dollar U S Department of Education Investing in

Innovation Grant. In addition, the this individual as served as the director for two comprehensive, youth mentoring programs; for over 700 at-risk, middle and high school students.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant's procedures for ensuring adequate feedback to ensure continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project is not sufficient. For example, the applicant proposes to monitor progress toward goals and performance measures during quarterly meetings, which will include revisiting the logic model and reviewing evaluator feedback. Quarterly collection of data over the life of the proposal is insufficient to ensure that the proposal is progressing towards its goals. The applicant also proposes to use quick and comprehensive data points in four key areas to provide an accurate view of performance. The applicant does not define the four key areas nor does the applicant articulate what the data points would be (Pages e38 and e39).

**Reader's Score: 18**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation**

**1. In determining the quality of the project evaluation to be conducted, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

**(1) The clarity and importance of the key questions to be addressed by the project evaluation, and the appropriateness of the methods for how each question will be addressed.**

**(2) The extent to which the evaluation plan includes a clear and credible analysis plan, including a proposed sample size and minimum detectable effect size that aligns with the expected project impact, and an analytic approach for addressing the research questions.**

**(3) The extent to which the evaluation plan clearly articulates the key components and outcomes of the project, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.**

**(4) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.**

**Note: In responding to this criterion, applicants should describe the key evaluation questions and address how the proposed evaluation methodologies will allow the project to answer those questions. The Secretary encourages applicants to include questions about the effectiveness of the proposed project with the specific student populations being served with grant funds. Further, the Secretary encourages applicants to identify what implementation and performance data the evaluation will generate and how the evaluation will provide data during the grant period to help indicate whether the project is on track to meet its goals. Finally, applicants should also address whether sufficient resources, which may include the qualifications of the independent evaluator, are included in the project budget to carry out the evaluation effectively.**

**Strengths:**

N/A

**Weaknesses:**

N/A

**Reader's Score: 0**

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 09/22/2014 09:12 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/22/2014 12:05 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Take Stock in Children, Inc. (U411C140021)

Reader #4: \*\*\*\*\*

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Summary Statement</b>		
<b>Summary Statement</b>		
1. Summary Statement	0	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	0	0
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	35	0
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	30	0
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan/Personnel	20	0
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	15	13
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	13
<b>Total</b>	100	13

# Technical Review Form

Panel #4 - 2014 Development Full Panels - 4: 84.411C

Reader #4: \*\*\*\*\*

Applicant: Take Stock in Children, Inc. (U411C140021)

## Questions

### Summary Statement - Summary Statement

#### 1. Summary Statement (Optional)

**General:**

N/A scored by another reviewer

Reader's Score: 0

### Selection Criteria - Significance

#### 1. In determining the significance of the project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project addresses the absolute priority the applicant is seeking to meet.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project would implement a novel approach as compared with what has been previously attempted nationally.

(3) The potential contribution of the proposed project to the development and advancement of theory, knowledge, and practices in the field of study.

**Note:** In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to explain how the applicant's proposed project addresses the absolute priority and the subpart that it seeks to meet. Additionally, the Secretary asks that applicants explain how the proposed project is unique. Applicants should explain how their proposed projects fit into existing theory, knowledge, or practice, and how their proposed projects will serve as exemplars for new practices in the field.

**Strengths:**

N/A scored by another reviewer

**Weaknesses:**

N/A scored by another reviewer

Reader's Score: 0

### Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

#### 1. In determining the quality of the proposed project design, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The clarity and coherence of the project goals, including the extent to which the proposed project articulates an explicit plan or actions to achieve its goals (e.g., a fully developed logic model of the proposed project).

**(2) The clarity, completeness, and coherence of the project goals, and whether the application includes a description of project activities that constitute a complete plan for achieving those goals, including the identification of potential risks to project success and strategies to mitigate those risks.**

**Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to address what activities the applicant will undertake in its proposed project, and how the applicant will ensure its project implementation is successful in achieving the project goals.**

**Strengths:**

N/A scored by another reviewer

**Weaknesses:**

N/A scored by another reviewer

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan**

**1. In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

**(1) The extent to which the management plan articulates key responsibilities and well-defined objectives, including the timelines and milestones for completion of major project activities, the metrics that will be used to assess progress on an ongoing basis, and annual performance targets the applicant will use to monitor whether the project is achieving its goals.**

**(2) The extent of the demonstrated commitment of any key partners or evidence of broad support from stakeholders whose participation is critical to the project 's long-term success.**

**(3) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.**

**(4) The extent to which the project director has experience managing projects of similar size and scope as the proposed project.**

**Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to address how the project team will evaluate the success or challenges of the project and use that feedback to make improvements to the project, and the role of key partners and their impact on the long-term success of the project, and how the project director 's prior experiences have prepared them for implementing the proposed project of this size and scope successfully.**

**Strengths:**

N/A scored by another reviewer

**Weaknesses:**

N/A scored by another reviewer

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation**

**In determining the quality of the project evaluation to be conducted, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

- (1) The clarity and importance of the key questions to be addressed by the project evaluation, and the appropriateness of the methods for how each question will be addressed.**
- (2) The extent to which the evaluation plan includes a clear and credible analysis plan, including a proposed sample size and minimum detectable effect size that aligns with the expected project impact, and an analytic approach for addressing the research questions.**
- (3) The extent to which the evaluation plan clearly articulates the key components and outcomes of the project, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.**
- (4) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.**

**Note:** In responding to this criterion, applicants should describe the key evaluation questions and address how the proposed evaluation methodologies will allow the project to answer those questions. The Secretary encourages applicants to include questions about the effectiveness of the proposed project with the specific student populations being served with grant funds. Further, the Secretary encourages applicants to identify what implementation and performance data the evaluation will generate and how the evaluation will provide data during the grant period to help indicate whether the project is on track to meet its goals. Finally, applicants should also address whether sufficient resources, which may include the qualifications of the independent evaluator, are included in the project budget to carry out the evaluation effectively.

**Strengths:**

The investigators propose an evaluation plan that addresses the evaluation requirements of the i3 funds. Investigators present relevant and key research questions that will be addressed by the methods and research design. Their study proposes using a short interrupted time series with comparison group design with a sufficiently large sample size to conduct a powerful study that will result in reliable answers to the research questions, preventing type I and II errors. Propensity score matching procedures at a 1:5 ratio were clearly specified and appropriate for the suggested study.

The analysis plan is specific and clear and includes the analytic procedures, estimates of statistical power, and minimal effect sizes that can be detected under the design assumptions. The investigators propose an evaluation plan that will collect information to assist with the identification of the project's specific features, documenting treatment fidelity and its impact on teachers and students.

Investigators will contract with The Evaluation Group (TEG), who will serve as an independent, third-party evaluator that will conduct all evaluation activities. TEG has more than 19 years of experience evaluation large federal education grants. Three specific evaluation experts with extensive experience with design and analysis were secured to assist with this project. This group will bring a lot of strengths to the project and sufficient resources were allocated to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

**Weaknesses:**

A couple of weaknesses identified for this project include the relatively large effect size associated with their confirmatory analysis of .49. This may not be too realistic unless investigators have good reasons to believe their program will generate such large effects. The project will also benefit with the provision of greater details on the description of their analysis procedures for qualitative data. Specifically, investigators should report how they intent to analyze interviews, focus groups, surveys, observation data, and the Wilder Collaboration Factors Inventory data to assess the fidelity of their program.

**Reader's Score: 13**

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 09/22/2014 12:05 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/25/2014 01:21 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Take Stock in Children, Inc. (U411C140021)

Reader #1: \*\*\*\*\*

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Summary Statement</b>		
<b>Summary Statement</b>		
1. Summary Statement	0	
<b>Sub Total</b>	0	
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	35	30
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	30	24
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan/Personnel	20	16
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	15	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	70
<b>Total</b>	100	70

# Technical Review Form

Panel #4 - 2014 Development Full Panels - 4: 84.411C

Reader #1: \*\*\*\*\*

Applicant: Take Stock in Children, Inc. (U411C140021)

## Questions

### Summary Statement - Summary Statement

#### 1. Summary Statement (Optional)

General:

Reader's Score:

### Selection Criteria - Significance

#### 1. In determining the significance of the project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project addresses the absolute priority the applicant is seeking to meet.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project would implement a novel approach as compared with what has been previously attempted nationally.

(3) The potential contribution of the proposed project to the development and advancement of theory, knowledge, and practices in the field of study.

**Note:** In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to explain how the applicant's proposed project addresses the absolute priority and the subpart that it seeks to meet. Additionally, the Secretary asks that applicants explain how the proposed project is unique. Applicants should explain how their proposed projects fit into existing theory, knowledge, or practice, and how their proposed projects will serve as exemplars for new practices in the field.

#### Strengths:

The project sufficiently addresses AP 2 by focusing on non-cognitive skills through mentoring, post-secondary preparation, and transition services (e18). The project treats urban, suburban and rural school populations in order to determine replicability across different types of school settings (e21). This approach is novel by addressing the three geographic locations and will contribute to theory in that implementation and results feedback should inform similar projects in different settings. The program model with the wrap-around support services which include scholarship to Florida State higher education institutions (e18) is structured to inform at the school, classroom, and student level. Table 2 (e24) outlines potential research contributions many of which relate to a rigorous evaluation of the project and alignment of resources and activities. The evaluation of mentoring with a non-traditional model can inform future projects.

#### Weaknesses:

It is not clear how the proposed project directly impacts whole school improvement in low-performing schools. The academic impact is not described with any research support. The correlation between mentoring and the improvement of low-performing schools is not supported with sufficient research or support.

Reader's Score: 30

### Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. In determining the quality of the proposed project design, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The clarity and coherence of the project goals, including the extent to which the proposed project articulates an explicit plan or actions to achieve its goals (e.g., a fully developed logic model of the proposed project).

(2) The clarity, completeness, and coherence of the project goals, and whether the application includes a description of project activities that constitute a complete plan for achieving those goals, including the identification of potential risks to project success and strategies to mitigate those risks.

**Note:** In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to address what activities the applicant will undertake in its proposed project, and how the applicant will ensure its project implementation is successful in achieving the project goals.

#### Strengths:

The program bases the project on addressing the reasons for underachievement, effective strategies to address this need, and maximizing available resources (e27). By identifying the needs and goals to "build evidence for non-cognitive skill sets" and strengthening "whole-school mentoring" (e26-27), the The collective impact team is responsible for overall program implementation and continuous monitoring. The 1:1 mentoring should result in large improvements for the 100 selected students (e27). The plan proceeds logically from grades 9 and 10 to 11 and 12 by addressing post-secondary plans. The students in grades 9 and 10 are entering their secondary school years while grades 11 and 12 are preparing for the next phase of post-secondary plans. Additionally, the goals reflect a focus on continuous improvement over baseline data.

#### Weaknesses:

Three days of staff development (e30) is not sufficient to train school staff in all aspects of the program. To fully integrate a new program, teachers and staff need time to internalize and develop routines for implementing and monitoring the fidelity to the program. There is not a plan for monitoring implementation fidelity other than the CIT which meets once a month. Though there is a mention of meeting "more frequently" at the start, it is not specific or clear how many times or what the start-up period is.

Reader's Score: 24

### Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the management plan articulates key responsibilities and well-defined objectives, including the timelines and milestones for completion of major project activities, the metrics that will be used to assess progress on an ongoing basis, and annual performance targets the applicant will use to monitor whether the project is achieving its goals.

(2) The extent of the demonstrated commitment of any key partners or evidence of broad support from stakeholders whose participation is critical to the project 's long-term success.

(3) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.

**(4) The extent to which the project director has experience managing projects of similar size and scope as the proposed project.**

**Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to address how the project team will evaluate the success or challenges of the project and use that feedback to make improvements to the project, and the role of key partners and their impact on the long-term success of the project, and how the project director 's prior experiences have prepared them for implementing the proposed project of this size and scope successfully.**

**Strengths:**

The project is sufficiently staffed with a full-time project director, a full-time CIC, Coach and a part-time communications specialist. The project director will oversee all project implementation and has experience in other I3 grants. The timelines and accountability lines are clear in Table 7 (e36). The CIT will oversee the project on the school level which will give stakeholders an opportunity for buy-in and feedback. Community partners such as non-profits, foundations, LEAs, and community colleges are listed (e38) and provide letters of support. There is a matching grant for scholarships (e38) from Goodwill Industries which will provide students assistance to move on to higher education. The UNISON management team will meet quarterly to revisit the logic model and to review evaluator feedback. This process will give the team an opportunity to be informed as the project moves forward.

**Weaknesses:**

The data is being collected on an annual basis which is not sufficient to provide for project adjustment of the relatively short-life of the project. There is not a system to collect formative data and monitor for ongoing improvement and program fidelity. Discipline and attendance data can be monitored on more regular basis. The post-secondary plans can be monitored on an ongoing basis as students work toward completion of them.

**Reader's Score: 16**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation**

**1. In determining the quality of the project evaluation to be conducted, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

**(1) The clarity and importance of the key questions to be addressed by the project evaluation, and the appropriateness of the methods for how each question will be addressed.**

**(2) The extent to which the evaluation plan includes a clear and credible analysis plan, including a proposed sample size and minimum detectable effect size that aligns with the expected project impact, and an analytic approach for addressing the research questions.**

**(3) The extent to which the evaluation plan clearly articulates the key components and outcomes of the project, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.**

**(4) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.**

**Note: In responding to this criterion, applicants should describe the key evaluation questions and address how the proposed evaluation methodologies will allow the project to answer those questions. The Secretary encourages applicants to include questions about the effectiveness of the proposed project with the specific student populations being served with grant funds. Further, the Secretary encourages applicants to identify what implementation and performance data the evaluation will generate and how the evaluation will provide data during the grant period to help indicate whether the project is on track to meet its goals. Finally, applicants should also address whether sufficient resources, which may include the qualifications of the independent evaluator, are included in the project budget to carry out the evaluation effectively.**

**Strengths:**

N/A - scored by another peer reviewer

**Weaknesses:**

N/A - scored by another peer reviewer.

**Reader's Score:**     **0**

---

**Status:**           Submitted

**Last Updated:**   09/25/2014 01:21 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/22/2014 12:59 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Take Stock in Children, Inc. (U411C140021)

Reader #3: \*\*\*\*\*

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Summary Statement</b>		
<b>Summary Statement</b>		
1. Summary Statement	0	
<b>Sub Total</b>	0	
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	35	35
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	30	27
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan/Personnel	20	18
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	15	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	80
<b>Total</b>	100	80

# Technical Review Form

Panel #4 - 2014 Development Full Panels - 4: 84.411C

Reader #3: \*\*\*\*\*

Applicant: Take Stock in Children, Inc. (U411C140021)

## Questions

### Summary Statement - Summary Statement

#### 1. Summary Statement (Optional)

General:

Reader's Score:

### Selection Criteria - Significance

#### 1. In determining the significance of the project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project addresses the absolute priority the applicant is seeking to meet.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project would implement a novel approach as compared with what has been previously attempted nationally.

(3) The potential contribution of the proposed project to the development and advancement of theory, knowledge, and practices in the field of study.

**Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to explain how the applicant's proposed project addresses the absolute priority and the subpart that it seeks to meet. Additionally, the Secretary asks that applicants explain how the proposed project is unique. Applicants should explain how their proposed projects fit into existing theory, knowledge, or practice, and how their proposed projects will serve as exemplars for new practices in the field.**

#### Strengths:

The applicant has previous experience in managing similar programs with a track record of success. On pages e18 and e19, a 2011 Florida Office of Program Policy Analysis and Government Accountability study was in support of the program because of the impact that the program has experienced working with students in the same community. On page e20 and e21, the applicant also provided a solid rationale for implementing a school-wide mentor program that has the potential to increase academic achievement in low performing schools and also that also improve students' non-cognitive abilities. The applicant defined how the program would increase high school graduation rates as well as college enrollment rates. On pages e23 and e24, the applicant included data to show the graduation and college enrollment rates for schools across the nations with similar demographics. If the program experiences similar patterns of success on a school-wide level, there may be implications for strategies that can potentially impact schools on a national level thus creating the potential to contribute to the advancement of theory, knowledge and current practices. On page e25, the applicant included research that supports school-based mentoring programs that includes wraparound services that can positively impact relationships as well as increase academic gains.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 35**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design**

1. In determining the quality of the proposed project design, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The clarity and coherence of the project goals, including the extent to which the proposed project articulates an explicit plan or actions to achieve its goals (e.g., a fully developed logic model of the proposed project).

(2) The clarity, completeness, and coherence of the project goals, and whether the application includes a description of project activities that constitute a complete plan for achieving those goals, including the identification of potential risks to project success and strategies to mitigate those risks.

**Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to address what activities the applicant will undertake in its proposed project, and how the applicant will ensure its project implementation is successful in achieving the project goals.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant provided program goals that were clear and consistent. On pages e33 and e34, the applicant included a rationale for each objective with reasonable targets associated with all goals. On pages e27 and e28, the applicant included a sample of the Curricula that will be used in the school-wide model and the Social-Emotional, Non-Cognitive Approach. This information provided insight as to how the program will be implemented at various stages of the grant. On pages e28 and e29, the applicant included a description of how the Collective Impact Team (CIT) will be used to support the school improvement plan. The composition of the CIT includes stakeholders who are able to lend support for services that might be needed for students or families. On page e31, the applicant provided information to show how students will be involved in Summer Leadership Institutes which will focus on preparing for college and career options. By including students in activities throughout the year helps to ensure that students will remain focused and are able to consistently utilize the newly gained skills. On page e31 and e32, the applicant described how they intend to include the families in the process through a formalized agreement. The applicant has a thorough plan for infusing parent workshops on college and career readiness. This strategy is significant in that it helps to ensure that all stakeholders are invested and committed to the program. On pages e34 and e35, the applicant identified potential risks and strategies to address each of the risks.

**Weaknesses:**

On page e30, the applicant states that the school staff will receive (3) days of train-the-trainer professional development which would not provide sufficient training time for the school staff to implement the program school wide. In order for the program to be implemented with fidelity, additional training will be needed from the onset and ongoing for the duration of the program. On pages e28 and e29, the applicant included information about the CIT team but did not include a sufficient plan for monitoring the progress of the program goals for the duration of the grant. This information will be helpful to monitor program goals with school improvement goals.

**Reader's Score: 27**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan**

1. In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

**(1) The extent to which the management plan articulates key responsibilities and well-defined objectives, including the timelines and milestones for completion of major project activities, the metrics that will be used to assess progress on an ongoing basis, and annual performance targets the applicant will use to monitor whether the project is achieving its goals.**

**(2) The extent of the demonstrated commitment of any key partners or evidence of broad support from stakeholders whose participation is critical to the project 's long-term success.**

**(3) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.**

**(4) The extent to which the project director has experience managing projects of similar size and scope as the proposed project.**

**Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to address how the project team will evaluate the success or challenges of the project and use that feedback to make improvements to the project, and the role of key partners and their impact on the long-term success of the project, and how the project director 's prior experiences have prepared them for implementing the proposed project of this size and scope successfully.**

**Strengths:**

On pages e35-e36 and in Appendix F, the applicant provided a solid description of the key personnel that are involved in the program with a description of associated duties. The information provided demonstrates that the key personnel have experience in working with successful mentoring programs associated with the applicant. On pages e36 and e37, the applicant included a detailed timeline with activities and milestones that are consistent with the program goals. On pages e36 and e37, the applicant has committed to providing updates and including progress monitoring with the advice of the program director and external evaluator. The applicant describes opportunities to involve district leaders and school leaders throughout the duration of the program. On page e38 and Appendix C, the applicant defines the commitment of program partners and included MOUs which are critical to the overall success of the program.

**Weaknesses:**

On pages e38 and e39, the applicant included information that the program will be monitored towards goals and performance measures quarterly but did not include a specific plan or description to show how the results would be used to inform the team. This information would be helpful to ensure that the program will be implemented with fidelity. On page e41, the applicant also provided information that states that the program will be formally evaluated annually which would not provide sufficient data to support the effectiveness of the program or allow for opportunities to refine the program as needed.

**Reader's Score: 18**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation**

**1. In determining the quality of the project evaluation to be conducted, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

**(1) The clarity and importance of the key questions to be addressed by the project evaluation, and the appropriateness of the methods for how each question will be addressed.**

**(2) The extent to which the evaluation plan includes a clear and credible analysis plan, including a proposed sample size and minimum detectable effect size that aligns with the expected project impact, and an analytic approach for addressing the research questions.**

**(3) The extent to which the evaluation plan clearly articulates the key components and outcomes of the project, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.**

**(4) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.**

**Note:** In responding to this criterion, applicants should describe the key evaluation questions and address how the proposed evaluation methodologies will allow the project to answer those questions. The Secretary encourages applicants to include questions about the effectiveness of the proposed project with the specific student populations being served with grant funds. Further, the Secretary encourages applicants to identify what implementation and performance data the evaluation will generate and how the evaluation will provide data during the grant period to help indicate whether the project is on track to meet its goals. Finally, applicants should also address whether sufficient resources, which may include the qualifications of the independent evaluator, are included in the project budget to carry out the evaluation effectively.

**Strengths:**

This section was reviewed by a different reviewer

**Weaknesses:**

This section was reviewed by a different reviewer

**Reader's Score:     0**

---

**Status:**           Submitted  
**Last Updated:**   09/22/2014 12:59 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/22/2014 08:25 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Take Stock in Children, Inc. (U411C140021)

Reader #5: \*\*\*\*\*

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Summary Statement</b>		
<b>Summary Statement</b>		
1. Summary Statement	0	
<b>Sub Total</b>	0	
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	35	0
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	30	0
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan/Personnel	20	0
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	15	11
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	11
<b>Total</b>	100	11

# Technical Review Form

Panel #4 - 2014 Development Full Panels - 4: 84.411C

Reader #5: \*\*\*\*\*

Applicant: Take Stock in Children, Inc. (U411C140021)

## Questions

### Summary Statement - Summary Statement

#### 1. Summary Statement (Optional)

General:

Reader's Score:

### Selection Criteria - Significance

#### 1. In determining the significance of the project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project addresses the absolute priority the applicant is seeking to meet.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project would implement a novel approach as compared with what has been previously attempted nationally.

(3) The potential contribution of the proposed project to the development and advancement of theory, knowledge, and practices in the field of study.

**Note:** In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to explain how the applicant's proposed project addresses the absolute priority and the subpart that it seeks to meet. Additionally, the Secretary asks that applicants explain how the proposed project is unique. Applicants should explain how their proposed projects fit into existing theory, knowledge, or practice, and how their proposed projects will serve as exemplars for new practices in the field.

**Strengths:**

na

**Weaknesses:**

na

Reader's Score: 0

### Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

#### 1. In determining the quality of the proposed project design, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The clarity and coherence of the project goals, including the extent to which the proposed project articulates an explicit plan or actions to achieve its goals (e.g., a fully developed logic model of the proposed project).

**(2) The clarity, completeness, and coherence of the project goals, and whether the application includes a description of project activities that constitute a complete plan for achieving those goals, including the identification of potential risks to project success and strategies to mitigate those risks.**

**Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to address what activities the applicant will undertake in its proposed project, and how the applicant will ensure its project implementation is successful in achieving the project goals.**

**Strengths:**

na

**Weaknesses:**

na

**Reader's Score: 0**

### **Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan**

**1. In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

**(1) The extent to which the management plan articulates key responsibilities and well-defined objectives, including the timelines and milestones for completion of major project activities, the metrics that will be used to assess progress on an ongoing basis, and annual performance targets the applicant will use to monitor whether the project is achieving its goals.**

**(2) The extent of the demonstrated commitment of any key partners or evidence of broad support from stakeholders whose participation is critical to the project 's long-term success.**

**(3) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.**

**(4) The extent to which the project director has experience managing projects of similar size and scope as the proposed project.**

**Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to address how the project team will evaluate the success or challenges of the project and use that feedback to make improvements to the project, and the role of key partners and their impact on the long-term success of the project, and how the project director 's prior experiences have prepared them for implementing the proposed project of this size and scope successfully.**

**Strengths:**

na

**Weaknesses:**

na

**Reader's Score: 0**

### **Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation**

**1. In determining the quality of the project evaluation to be conducted, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

(1) The clarity and importance of the key questions to be addressed by the project evaluation, and the appropriateness of the methods for how each question will be addressed.

(2) The extent to which the evaluation plan includes a clear and credible analysis plan, including a proposed sample size and minimum detectable effect size that aligns with the expected project impact, and an analytic approach for addressing the research questions.

(3) The extent to which the evaluation plan clearly articulates the key components and outcomes of the project, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.

(4) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

**Note:** In responding to this criterion, applicants should describe the key evaluation questions and address how the proposed evaluation methodologies will allow the project to answer those questions. The Secretary encourages applicants to include questions about the effectiveness of the proposed project with the specific student populations being served with grant funds. Further, the Secretary encourages applicants to identify what implementation and performance data the evaluation will generate and how the evaluation will provide data during the grant period to help indicate whether the project is on track to meet its goals. Finally, applicants should also address whether sufficient resources, which may include the qualifications of the independent evaluator, are included in the project budget to carry out the evaluation effectively.

**Strengths:**

The evaluation plan outlined a quasi-experimental design for a high-school mentoring program. The evaluator proposed a short interrupted time series design with a comparison group, which is appropriate for the overall design of the program given its multiple-year design. The description of analyses for the formative evaluation include three key topical areas, program delivery, feedback and program fidelity (Appendix D). The confirmatory and exploratory research questions address the program output and academic outcomes specified in the logic model. The tabulation of evaluation timeline and cohort design (p.23) outlines the sample design and outcome measures clearly.

**Weaknesses:**

The proposal addresses subpart B to improve non-cognitive abilities, but the evaluation does not include a non-cognitive outcome in its analysis although such outcome is a key to the program. (p.23) The MDES is rather high and requires the evaluator to provide justifications for sufficient power to detect program effects. For example, how the sample of two cohorts can be used to boost power. The business as usual condition is not sufficiently described, especially regarding the reduction of contaminations, e.g., college information sessions for students in the comparison group. It is not clear if the student sample includes all students in the participating schools or a subgroup of students who volunteer. As a result, the school-level matching may not be adequate to adjust for group-level differences to improve precision of estimates, because only motivated students may attend which affect the interpretation of the study results. The number of students and parents does not seem to match. (p.41) The evaluation plan can also be strengthened by briefly describing data sources and data collection, especially qualitative data mentioned on page 25, to inform the program implementation, e.g., how the burden on school staff affect program implementation.

**Reader's Score:** 11

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 09/22/2014 08:25 PM