

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/13/2019 10:40 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Center for Supportive Schools (U411C190018)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	25	25
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	35	35
Adequacy of Resources/Quality of Management Plan		
1. Resources/Management Plan	20	20
Sub Total	80	80
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority		
1. Absolute Priority 3	5	0
Sub Total	5	0
Total	85	80

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - EIR Early Phase Tier 1 - 1: 84.411C

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Center for Supportive Schools (U411C190018)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

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

(1) The potential contribution of the proposed project to increased knowledge or understanding of educational problems, issues, or effective strategies.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project involves the development or demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies.

Strengths:

1. The potential contribution of the AM project to the educational problem of students dropping out of school is paramount. Identifying effective, evidence-based, turn key models for mentoring is essential to changing the trajectory of some urban and rural districts who have high dropout rates. As clearly delineated, the AM project will serve high need students in grades 10 and 11, in up to 20 high schools in low-income rural communities in North Carolina and urban communities in New York (1). Consequently, there is a plan to implement and scale the one to one, AM mentoring approach in other schools in North Carolina, New York and across the country.

2. The AM model extends the research of the empirically evidenced-based Behavior Monitoring & Reinforcement Program which was designed for middle school students (1). This project will replicate similar strategies for high school students. The project will measure intrinsic values and attitudes as well as external school measures (course completion, critical indicators for dropping out, and attendance) (1). The project is of national significance because of the low graduation rates for African Americans, Hispanics, low income students, limited English proficient students, and students with disabilities (2-3) and because there is a gap in research literature that demonstrates uniform mentoring practices (5,8).

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score: 25

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

(1) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.

(2) The extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework.

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

Strengths:

1. The goals 1, 2, and 3 and the relative objectives are clearly identified, specific and measurable (9-10). Because of this, they fully support the proposer's ability to achieve the proposed project.
2. There is a satisfactory conceptual framework underlying the proposed research activity as depicted on p. 11 and further described on pp.11-14. The quality of the learning theory framework is further substantiated and clarified by the narrative in Appendix G (e206-e208) which explains the belief that if actions and feelings are learned, then mentors, teachers, and parent/guardians can impact at-risk high school attendance, course completion and graduation by taking notice of students, providing praise to students, and giving students feedback on actions that lead them to success..
3. The protocols, rubrics, fidelity checks, selection criteria and action plan are appropriate and fitting to support ongoing feedback and continuous improvement. Additionally, check points for specific concerns strengthen the proposal in terms on improvement and replicability (14, 16-17).

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 35

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources/Quality of Management Plan

1. **The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources and the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the adequacy of resources and quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**
 - (1) **The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.**
 - (2) **The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel.**
 - (3) **The potential for continued support of the project after Federal funding ends, including, as appropriate, the demonstrated commitment of appropriate entities to such support.**

Strengths:

1. The proposal contains a detailed implementation timeline, with specific activities that are connected to specific implementation activities and evaluation measures. Multiple measures of evaluation are present (16-17). Collectively, these actions demonstrate a sound management plan.
2. Staff is well versed in project and grant management, research and psychology. All of which are critical to the success of grant implementation (p. 18)
3. By taking a multi-faceted approach to funding, proposers have greatly strengthened the potential for program sustainability. First, most of the funding will support initial startup costs which are not recurring (19). Second, the model is highly structured and can be successfully managed and repeated through the Train-the-Trainer model (20). In addition, CSS has already decided to repurpose existing funds to support continuation of the AM model (21). Through high quality

training, ongoing support, using caring adult employees during the school day costs for sustainability are minimized (19).

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 20

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority

1. Within Absolute Priority 3, we give competitive preference to applications that address the following priority:

Projects designed to improve student achievement or other educational outcomes in computer science (as defined in the notice). These projects must address the following priority area:

Expanding access to and participation in rigorous computer science (as defined in the notice) coursework for traditionally underrepresented students such as racial or ethnic minorities, women, students in communities served by rural local educational agencies (as defined in the notice), children or students with disabilities (as defined in the notice), or low-income individuals (as defined under section 312(g) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended).

Note: Projects addressing this priority must be administered in a manner consistent with nondiscrimination requirements contained in the U.S. Constitution and Federal civil rights laws.

Strengths:

Not applicable.

Weaknesses:

Not applicable.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/13/2019 10:40 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/12/2019 08:46 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Center for Supportive Schools (U411C190018)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	25	25
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	35	35
Adequacy of Resources/Quality of Management Plan		
1. Resources/Management Plan	20	20
Sub Total	80	80
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority		
1. Absolute Priority 3	5	0
Sub Total	5	0
Total	85	80

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - EIR Early Phase Tier 1 - 1: 84.411C

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Center for Supportive Schools (U411C190018)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

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

(1) The potential contribution of the proposed project to increased knowledge or understanding of educational problems, issues, or effective strategies.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project involves the development or demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies.

Strengths:

(1)The applicant has duly noted how their project will address nationally significant problems related to poor academic and social outcomes among students in “high need” areas (28-30). First, they have provided clear descriptions of their target students and have identified the criteria in which they will select “high risk” students (39) Their plan is to assess the efficacy of a school based mentoring model in low income high schools across multiple communities in North Carolina (up to 20) as well as in urban communities in New York City (31, 32). Through a clear dissemination plan, which includes professional conferences and publications, they aim to provide useful information regarding strategies to improve social and emotional learning (SEL), improve educational mindsets, and enhance student engagement, and support academic and other school-related outcomes (44). Their plan clearly demonstrates efforts to potentially increase the knowledge and understanding of educational and social problems.

(2)The applicant has proposed to adapt a proven middle school group mentoring model for use with individual students in high schools. The Achievement Mentoring model will be utilized in up to 20 high schools in rural communities in North Carolina and urban communities in NYC and other regions that primarily serve low-income and minority students. This will be a high school adaptation of the Behavior Monitoring & Reinforcement Program (BMRP), a group mentoring model for middle school students (32). They have provided ample evidence that shows the effectiveness and promise as a new strategy for mentorship, as the Achievement Mentoring Model has been piloted in high schools since 2011, and has been evaluated as Promising by the National Mentoring Resource Research Board and the National Institute of Justice though as an intervention specifically for urban minority freshmen (34-35).

Weaknesses:

None noted

Reader's Score: 25

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

(1) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed

project are clearly specified and measurable.

(2) The extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework.

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

Strengths:

(1)The applicant thoroughly describes the proposed project measures, including goals that address student engagement, progression, educational mindsets as well as effective implementation. The applicant's objectives and outcomes are plainly specified and as a means of measurement, include benchmarks that will be suitable to measure and gauge student self-efficacy, program participation as well as academic achievement. Benchmarks and expected outcomes will provide a basis of assessment to make modifications within the program if projections are not met. (36)

(2)The applicant has presented a clear conceptual framework that identifies key components of the project and addresses quality activities for that framework. They have included a logic model that demonstrates how project activities will support their evidence based mentoring concepts. For example, their model appropriately demonstrates how professional development, mentor activities as well as student activities will yield increased self-efficacy and academic outcomes in at risk students. To support this, within the model, they have included cognitive-behavioral intervention that is grounded in learning theory in order to self-efficacy among mentees (40).

(3)The applicant has provided a robust plan for monitoring progress and success through continuous feedback and improvement methods. District, school and site-based leaders have been appropriately included as part of the feedback loop to ensure that there is effective communication among all stakeholders. For example, they will include weekly feedback initiatives that will allow for frequent times for assessment in order quickly asses if improvements are needed. Quarterly feedback will also be used to asses the effectiveness and impact of their implementation activities which will be useful in assessing the progress towards the program's expected outcomes. (41)

Weaknesses:

None noted

Reader's Score: 35

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources/Quality of Management Plan

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

(1) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.

(2) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel.

(3) The potential for continued support of the project after Federal funding ends, including, as appropriate, the demonstrated commitment of appropriate entities to such support.

Strengths:

(1)The applicant provides efficient evidence of how they propose to complete project activities on-time and within budget. For example, the applicant has established a strong grant management plan that will focus efforts on progress monitoring and oversight of coordination of services, timely implementation. For example, the Project Director who has 19 years of expertise directing federally and state-funded studies will oversee all aspects of the project; develop project reports and will develop external communication. To demonstrate their commitment to timely implementation, a comprehensive timeline is also provided highlighting project milestones. Budgetary items are suitable as proposed items clearly correlate with activities and staff descriptions with the Narrative (44, 232-269)

(2)Detailed professional qualifications, experience, and administrative skills are outlined for key personnel. For example, the Principle Investigator has over 10 years of experience in supervising evaluations as has experience in directing research projects. This experience will be appropriate as he will oversee the development of the impact evaluation/analysis plan (46). Also noted is Morgan Silk, the National Curriculum & Training Director, who will oversee all training and curriculum development and has over 5 years as a Curriculum and Training Manager. This experience will also be important as mentor training will be a vital component of their model. (39, APPENDIX)

(3)The applicant has appropriately demonstrated that they have the resources and structure to sustain the project activities. Their program is designed to be integrated into existing curriculum. Likewise, they have noted that through efforts such as their train the trainer approaches, other school staff can be trained as mentors, thus allowing the school to retain the program for little cost (46).

Weaknesses:

None noted

Reader's Score: 20

Priority Questions**Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority****1. Within Absolute Priority 3, we give competitive preference to applications that address the following priority:**

Projects designed to improve student achievement or other educational outcomes in computer science (as defined in the notice). These projects must address the following priority area:

Expanding access to and participation in rigorous computer science (as defined in the notice) coursework for traditionally underrepresented students such as racial or ethnic minorities, women, students in communities served by rural local educational agencies (as defined in the notice), children or students with disabilities (as defined in the notice), or low-income individuals (as defined under section 312(g) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended).

Note: Projects addressing this priority must be administered in a manner consistent with nondiscrimination requirements contained in the U.S. Constitution and Federal civil rights laws.

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: **0**

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/12/2019 08:46 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/12/2019 09:12 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Center for Supportive Schools (U411C190018)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	25	25
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	35	34
Adequacy of Resources/Quality of Management Plan		
1. Resources/Management Plan	20	20
Sub Total	80	79
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority		
1. Absolute Priority 3	5	0
Sub Total	5	0
Total	85	79

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - EIR Early Phase Tier 1 - 1: 84.411C

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Center for Supportive Schools (U411C190018)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

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

(1) The potential contribution of the proposed project to increased knowledge or understanding of educational problems, issues, or effective strategies.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project involves the development or demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies.

Strengths:

(1) The Applicant posits that there is a national need for a mentoring intervention to improve social and emotional learning (SEL). (p. e 28). The proposed project is targeting high-need 10th and 11th grade students in twenty low- income, rural communities in both North Carolina and New York. The applicant presents research on pgs. e30 – e32 comparing national data and local data and the gaps that exist between low-income students and their middle- and upper-income peers. The applicant's contribution to the existing knowledge base of how school-based mentoring efforts can help solve persistent problems in education is strongly emphasized.

(2) The proposed project is focused on further developing and implementing a school-based mentoring program known as Achievement Mentoring that is an adaptation of another high school program. The applicant's approach is grounded in strengths-promotion rather than risk-reduction, which yields larger positive effects for a mentoring program. This offers the proposed project the likelihood of becoming integrated into the school system.

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 25

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

(1) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.

(2) The extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework.

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

Strengths:

- (1) The Applicant does an excellent job demonstrating its conceptual framework for the proposed project. It presents a body of research on resilience in at-risk youth and the role of supportive adults. The applicant presents a table on p. e36 that shows adequate links to objectives and outcomes, e.g., improving students' progression in school, (p. e36). Key objectives are supported by research that provides the sample measure. The profile information provided on p. e37 strengthens the message of the at-risk target population.
- (2) The conceptual framework that the applicant presents on pgs. e38 – e 41, provides considerable information to support the cognitive-behavioral intervention. The proposed project will provide one-on-one mentoring activities for identified, high risk students. The applicant proposes to include resources for assessing qualifications and fit for prospective mentors. The information provided presents a structured approach to cultivate ties between youth and adults.
- (3) The applicant provides a table on p. e41 that gives clear details to show continuous efficacy of the intervention and to identify features and conditions necessary for sustainability, effective replication, and testing in other settings.

Weaknesses:

- (1) On the table on p. e36, the applicant could explain and provide more detail on what the substance of the activity with regards to the mentor-mentee session will provide. For example, the applicant presents the "mentor-mentee" sessions, however, does not detail what is involved and how these sessions will benefit the students.

Reader's Score: 34

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources/Quality of Management Plan

1. **The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources and the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the adequacy of resources and quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**
 - (1) **The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.**
 - (2) **The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel.**
 - (3) **The potential for continued support of the project after Federal funding ends, including, as appropriate, the demonstrated commitment of appropriate entities to such support.**

Strengths:

- (1) The management plan is very comprehensive, showing activities, milestones, key project activities and key dates. (pgs. e42 – e 46) The management structure is very well organized with key stakeholders represented, including a project team, work group and site-based stakeholder teams that are committed to supporting the effort of the project.
- (2) The qualifications, experience and the roles and responsibilities are detailed on pgs. e45-e47 and are clear and include a strong team that will provide support around each of the areas of the project. The table describes the name and title and the description of the role that the key personnel is assigned to.

(3) The proposed project speaks to becoming integrated into the fabric of the school day and sustained permanency. The notion of absorption into the school day will provide for a built in mechanism for participation and retention. This concept will lend itself well to large scale replication and sustainability (p. e46).

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 20

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority

1. Within Absolute Priority 3, we give competitive preference to applications that address the following priority:

Projects designed to improve student achievement or other educational outcomes in computer science (as defined in the notice). These projects must address the following priority area:

Expanding access to and participation in rigorous computer science (as defined in the notice) coursework for traditionally underrepresented students such as racial or ethnic minorities, women, students in communities served by rural local educational agencies (as defined in the notice), children or students with disabilities (as defined in the notice), or low-income individuals (as defined under section 312(g) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended).

Note: Projects addressing this priority must be administered in a manner consistent with nondiscrimination requirements contained in the U.S. Constitution and Federal civil rights laws.

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/12/2019 09:12 AM