

Technical Review Cover Sheet

Panel Details

Fiscal Year 2019 **CFDA/Subprogram** 84.215J **Schedule No** 1 **Tier No.** 1
Panel Name FY19 FSCS - 10

Applicant Name Board of Education of the City of Peoria **PR/Award No** U215J190024

Questions

	Points Possible	Points Scored
1. Selection Criteria		
Project Design	15	14
Project Services	25	25
Resources	15	15
Management Plan	20	20
Project Evaluation	25	25
<hr/>		
TOTAL	100	99

Priority Questions

1. Competitive Preference Priority 2

Competitive Consortiums 1 1

2. Competitive Preference Priority 3

History Effectiveness 1 1

TOTAL **2** **2**

GRAND TOTAL **102** **101**

Reviewer Name

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—

(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 the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs.

Strengths

(1) The objectives described are measurable with outcomes that can be reasonably achieved by the project. For example, one objective is to provide academic support to increase the number of students who improve in math skills and strategies. The applicant provides measurable outcomes for the targeted number of students for each project year projecting a minimum of 50% success rate for students; this will be measured through school student assessment data, pre/post test scores and end-of-school year data (pgs.20-28). For each of the objective presented, specific data collection methods and persons responsible are described (i.e.50% of students will participate in community service activities which will be measured through attendance records collected by the group leaders and site coordinators)(pg. 25). The inclusion of such information indicates a clearly thought out implementation plan to ensure goals are met.

(2) The applicant provides data as support to describe the needs of the targeted population. Using findings from a recent needs assessments, families within the targeted zip code have a median income of only \$21, 656 which is lower than the overall city rate of \$51,632. Further, 47.6% of adults within the target area are unemployed and 44.2% of families live below the poverty level. Other contributory factors are provided including high crime rates and low educational attainment rates i.e. 29.1% of the population do not have a high school diploma. Students suffer from physical abuse, neglect, mental illness, stress and more. Other mitigating factors include large classroom sizes, high teacher turnover and numerous substitute teachers (pgs. 7-20). The applicant proposes to address the needs identified with collaborative partners who will provide services such as early childhood programs, in/out of school academic enrichment services and others.

Weaknesses

(1) No weaknesses noted.

(2) The applicant did not provide academic data relevant to the schools to be served by the project. The inclusion of this information would help to further understand the needs directly related to the targeted schools.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 14

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Services

2.

The Secretary considers the quality of the services to be provided by the proposed project. In determining the quality of project services, the Secretary considers the quality and sufficiency of strategies for ensuring equal access and treatment for eligible project participants who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability. In addition, the Secretary considers the following—

(1) The likely impact of the services to be provided by the proposed project on the intended recipients of those services.

(2) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project involve the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project services.

Strengths

1) Evidence is provided detailing the plans to expand the current pipeline of services to support the targeted population (i.e. early childhood education, in/out-of-school programs, family engagement activities) in addition to several other wraparound services. Noteworthy strategies for each of the pipeline services to be offered are described representing a well-developed plan of implementation. For example, for pipeline service#2: provide high quality in/out of school services, one strategy is to provide 6 new math tutors, 2 new teachers, success coaches, field trips, arts etc. The services to be provided will enhance those currently in place and some will be new based upon identified needs (pgs. 28-36). The impact of the beneficiaries is evident due to the accessibility of services to eligible participants within the targeted schools/community and the quality/frequency of services to be provided. For example, after school, project-based online homework and small-group instruction will be offered as additional instructional opportunities for students. The small group instruction will allow more intimate time with students to address their individual needs (pgs.36-38).

(2) The information provided in the narrative clearly demonstrates that collaborative partners are committed to the project services to be provided. Partner support is evident and organization resources and supports are clearly described such as delivery of classes/activities and instructors from the Peoria Park District and Career Links who will provide career service training for parents and students (pgs. e119 & e124-e125).

Weaknesses

- (1) No weaknesses noted.
- (2) No weaknesses noted.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 25

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

3.

The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources for the proposed project. In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors—

- (1) The relevance and demonstrated commitment of each partner in the proposed project to the implementation and success of the project;**
- (2) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the number of persons to be served and to the anticipated results and benefits.**

Strengths

(1) There is demonstrated commitment to the project as evidenced through Letters of Support and MOUs which document the role of each partner to ensure successful project implementation. For example, Family Core, a longtime partner will provide social, emotional services such as therapeutic counseling, anger management, parent education and other services (pg. e131). Additionally, the Tri-County Urban League will provide activities and workshops promoting integrated career, academic learning and financial literacy programming for students and families (pg. e116).

(2) The costs for the project appear is reasonable in relation to the students and parents to be served each year. Specifically, the plan is to serve 150 beneficiaries in Year 1. with a projected increase to 250 recipients between Years 2-5. This project is cost effective given the level of services to be provided, cost sharing, and coordinated partner and stakeholder support. For example, cost sharing support includes 20% (\$8,000) of the project director's salary which will be paid with non-federal funds (non-federal budget pgs. e219-e228).

Weaknesses

- (1) No weaknesses noted.
- (2) No weaknesses noted.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

4.

The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the 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 extent to which the time commitments of the project director and principal investigator and other key project personnel are appropriate and adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project.

Strengths

(1) The management structure is detailed and provides a general overview of the project implementation of services to be provided. Specifically, the project director will be responsible for overall project management including working with site coordinators, schedules, budgets, grants management and daily oversight. For each of the positions presented, the time commitment for each work task and key positions is provided (i.e. site coordinators will commit 20% of time to scheduling events, 15% of time to data collection/tracking and 20% of time on other tasks such as weekly meetings, monthly partner meetings, team meetings and professional development) (pgs. 72-80). The timeline on pages 90-91 offers information detailing the milestones for some activities and persons responsible. For example, site coordinators will collect student interest surveys within four weeks of award notification and mid-year evaluations will be conducted by the evaluator at day 42 of the project (pgs. 90-91).

(2) A detailed description of the time commitment and staff responsible for project implementation and oversight is provided. For example, the project director, site coordinator and family core counselor are all full-time positions which will adequately support the project objectives. For example, the full time project director will provide daily oversight for the project and site coordinators will work with all stakeholders to ensure successful on-time services and project implementation (pgs.68-74).

Weaknesses

(1) No weaknesses noted.
(2) No weaknesses noted.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

5.

The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors—

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project.

(2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible.

(3) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes.

Strengths

(1) The evaluation plan is aligned to the project's goals and objectives representing a coherent approach to assessing the formative and summative progress of the project. The data sources and analysis methods are listed, in addition to the responsible individuals. The findings will be used to inform staff, parents, partners and stakeholders through annual project evaluation reports, meetings and other venues so that all are informed (pgs. 81-86).

(2) The evaluation methods reflect an appropriate use of qualitative and quantitative research methods aligned to the project's goals, objectives and logic model. Methods will include the use of pre/post tests, surveys, focus groups, observations, individual learning plans, self-assessments and others will be used (pgs.81-86 & 137-146). For each of the proposed project objectives there is an aligned evaluation method. For example, one objective states that 50% of students will gain support in math skills and strategies will be measured through assessments and school data collected by the site coordinator (pg. 21). The collection of school data, assessments and project records and analysis will ensure the quality and timeliness of the evaluation process.

(3) The continuous collection of data from the schools, partners, students, parents and staff will allow opportunities for continual analysis thus providing opportunities for project changes as needed. Through this process and continuous project improvement will help to validate the performance data relevant to the project outcomes and goals presented (pgs. 81-86).

Weaknesses

(1) No weaknesses noted. (2) No weaknesses noted. (3) No weaknesses noted.

Question Status: Completed

Reviewer Score: 25

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority 2 - Broad Competitive Consortiums

1.

Competitive Preference Priority 2

Broad Competitive Consortiums

The Secretary gives priority to an applicant that demonstrates that it is a consortium comprised of a broad representation of stakeholders.

Strengths

The Board of Education of the City of Peoria provides evidence to show they are part of a cadre of consortium partners dedicated to supporting the targeted population. The consortium includes several organizations such as the Illinois Math Academy, Tri-County Urban League, Junior Achievement, Peoria Park District and others. Most impressive is the letter of support provided by Align Peoria which consist of 165 partners including institutions, businesses, trade agencies and others who also are invested in providing quality services to the community (pg.2).

Weaknesses

No weaknesses noted.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 1

Competitive Preference Priority 3 - History Effectiveness

2.

Competitive Preference Priority 3

History Effectiveness

The Secretary gives priority to an applicant that demonstrates that it is a consortium with a history of effectiveness.

Strengths

Evidence is provided to show the organization and consortium partners have a history of providing effective services through several federal, state and local grant programs such as a Full-Service project and two 21st Century Community Learning Center programs. For example, through a long-standing relationship with the Illinois Math Academy programs such as Lego Robotics have supported math instruction for students and the Peoria Park District provides coaches/instruction for the 21st Century after-school program in addition to a variety of field trips and summer programming. As a continuum of service, the Board of Education of the City of Peoria proposes to continue to align services with other community partners as a collective effort to continue to address community needs through the proposed expansion program services to be provided (pg.2).

Weaknesses

No weaknesses noted.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 1

Technical Review Cover Sheet

Panel Details

Fiscal Year 2019 **CFDA/Subprogram** 84.215J **Schedule No** 1 **Tier No.** 1
Panel Name FY19 FSCS - 10

Applicant Name Board of Education of the City of Peoria **PR/Award No** U215J190024

Questions

	Points Possible	Points Scored
1. Selection Criteria		
Project Design	15	15
Project Services	25	25
Resources	15	15
Management Plan	20	20
Project Evaluation	25	25

TOTAL	100	100
--------------	------------	------------

Priority Questions

1. Competitive Preference Priority 2

Competitive Consortiums	1	1
-------------------------	---	---

2. Competitive Preference Priority 3

History Effectiveness	1	1
-----------------------	---	---

TOTAL	2	2
--------------	----------	----------

GRAND TOTAL	102	102
--------------------	------------	------------

Technical Review Form

Applicant Name Board of Education of the City of Peoria **PR/Award No** U215J190024

Reviewer Name

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—

(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 the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs.

Strengths

(1) The applicant adequately provided goals, objectives aligned with measurable performance outcomes. For example, the applicant will provide academic support in mathematics skills and strategies. The objective is to improve student scores on math assessments. The performance measure is that 50% of students will meet yearly targeted growth as indicated on test data. Each of the objectives are similarly as thorough and aligned with the overall project goal to improve academic performance.(pgs. 16-20)

(2) The applicant effectively demonstrated that the proposed project design is appropriate to address the targeted population identified needs. The applicant indicated that 91% of the residents do not have a high school diploma. 44.2% of the residents are living below the poverty level. Students are failing in school and on the academic assessments, have language difficulties, and likely to be suspended or expelled. Based on these identified needs, the applicant is proposing a pipeline of services to address the academic, social-emotional and physical well-being of children and families. The pipeline will begin with early childhood and expand through adulthood to ensure a continuum of services will address all the needs. (pgs. 25-28)

Weaknesses

- (1) No weaknesses noted.
- (2) No weaknesses noted.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Services

2.

The Secretary considers the quality of the services to be provided by the proposed project. In determining the quality of project services, the Secretary considers the quality and sufficiency of strategies for ensuring equal access and treatment for eligible project participants who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability. In addition, the Secretary considers the following—

- (1) The likely impact of the services to be provided by the proposed project on the intended recipients of those services.**
- (2) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project involve the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project services.**

Strengths

(1) The applicant effectively demonstrated that the project services as designed have the potential to impact the intended participants. For example, the proposed project will provide a continuum of services to support improving literacy in the area. For example, the applicant will operate a bookmobile in collaboration with the library. The bookmobile will provide access to books for children and parents. Additionally, the applicant will hire instructional coaches for the after-school program. Similar efforts will be implemented to improve math scores. For each pipeline services the applicant thoroughly aligned an implementation plan to address the services. (pgs. 34-38)

(2) The applicant effectively demonstrated that the Board of Education of the City of Peoria has amassed a consortium of partners willing to supporting the targeted population and region. The

consortium includes agencies and organizations such as the Illinois Math Academy, Tri-County Urban League, Junior Achievement, Peoria Park District and others. The applicant indicated that over 165 letters of support have been provided that indicate a leveraging of resources. (pg.2).

Weaknesses

- (1) No weaknesses noted.
- (2) No weaknesses noted.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 25

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

3.

The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources for the proposed project. In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors—

- (1) The relevance and demonstrated commitment of each partner in the proposed project to the implementation and success of the project;**
- (2) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the number of persons to be served and to the anticipated results and benefits.**

Strengths

(1) The applicant clearly evidenced that the project will be supported by collaborative partners. The applicant provided detailed information to inform each of the partner contributions. The information is presented in the MOU and with supports letters. For example, the Tri-County Urban League has agreed to provide residents with personalized learning and consultation with the GED courses and financial literacy training. (pgs. 40-44 and Appendix)

(2) The applicant clearly demonstrated that the costs for the proposed project is reasonable in relation to the students and parents to be served each year. The applicant indicated that the project will serve 150 participants in the first year and projected increase to 250 recipients between Years 2-5. The applicant provided documentation that the due to cost sharing with partner and coordinating services the cost sharing support id 20% of the project. For example, 20% or (\$8000) of the project director's salary will be paid with non-federal funds. (pgs. e219-e228 and Budget Appendix)

Weaknesses

- (1) No weaknesses noted.
- (2) No weaknesses noted.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

4.

The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the 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 extent to which the time commitments of the project director and principal investigator and other key project personnel are appropriate and adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project.

Strengths

(1) The applicant provided a comprehensive and detailed management plan. The management plan is aligned with each goal and key objective to be accomplished. The plan has associated tasks and activities with a reasonable timeline and persons responsible for implementing the tasks. The applicant clearly aligned milestones for reaching program outcomes and how those outcomes will be measured. The project director will oversee the management plan and create an action plan for each school. The project director will review quarterly the program progress of meeting goals and objectives. Based on a review of the management plan and the monitoring system, the proposed project has the potential for accomplishing project tasks on time and within budget. (pgs. 60-63)

(2) The application effectively demonstrated that the project director and the key personnel has been allocated adequate time to implement and provide oversight for the project. For example, the project director, site coordinator and family core counselor are all full-time positions and other key staff time commitments are full-time. The applicant provided job descriptions that indicated the levels of responsibility for each position. (pgs. 68-74).

Weaknesses

- (1) No weaknesses noted.

(2) No weaknesses noted.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

5.

The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors—

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project.

(2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible.

(3) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes.

Strengths

(1) The applicant provided a comprehensively detailed evaluation plan that is aligned with specific measures to ascertain the effectiveness of the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project. The applicant indicated that the goal of the evaluation is to conduct an analysis of the all the activities designed to lead to the long-term outcomes of the Full-Service Community Schools program. For example, the applicant is seeking to find out how the project improved the coordination, integration, accessibility and effectiveness of services for students and families in four target schools. The Logic Model is thoroughly aligned with the major goals, strategies and long-term and short-term outcomes and descriptions of the measurable objectives and outcomes. The Logic Model provided a clear blueprint for the effect implementation of the evaluation. (pgs. 70-72)

(2) The applicant successfully demonstrated that the proposed evaluation plan includes strong methods of evaluation that will be aligned with objective performance measures capable of producing quantitative and qualitative data by the end of the grant period. The evaluation will (1) describe the implementation of the core elements of the pipeline of services model, (2) identify strategic elements of the network's expansion and sustainability; and (3) examine student retention and academic success outcomes. The evaluation team will work with leadership to develop measurable indicators for the key components of the model using surveys, interviews, data review, classroom observations and other measurable mixed method. The applicant indicated that the evaluation will provide timely feedback and time for midcourse adjustments and to increase the likelihood of success. (pgs. 81-86)

(3) The applicant effectively demonstrated that the proposed project will utilize data to measure and examine the extent to which it is making progress toward achieving its objectives. The process

will include both formative evaluation and summative evaluation methods. The applicant will use the data at the end of each project year to ascertain whether the project has met the objectives. The evaluation plan creates a cycle of assessment to make inferences that are scientifically objective, accurate, conclusive, and occur at pre-determined benchmarks. (pgs. 81-86)

Weaknesses

- (1) No weaknesses noted.
- (2) No weaknesses noted.
- (3) No weaknesses noted.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 25

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority 2 - Broad Competitive Consortiums

1.

Competitive Preference Priority 2

Broad Competitive Consortiums

The Secretary gives priority to an applicant that demonstrates that it is a consortium comprised of a broad representation of stakeholders.

Strengths

The applicant effectively demonstrated that the Board of Education of the City of Peoria has amassed a consortium of partners willing to supporting the targeted population and region. The consortium includes agencies and organizations such as the Illinois Math Academy, Tri-County Urban League, Junior Achievement, Peoria Park District and others. The applicant indicated that over 165 letter of support have been provided. (pg.2).

Weaknesses

No weaknesses noted.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 1

Competitive Preference Priority 3 - History Effectiveness

2.

Competitive Preference Priority 3

History Effectiveness

The Secretary gives priority to an applicant that demonstrates that it is a consortium with a history of effectiveness.

Strengths

The applicant successfully demonstrated that the proposed project partners has a history of effectively providing services to other federal and state programs, such as a two 21st Century Community Learning Center programs and a Full-Service Community School project. The partners have a history of aligning their projects based on the current needs of the targeted communities. (pg. 2)) The consortium includes agencies and organizations with service and project history include: Illinois Math Academy, Tri-County Urban League, Junior Achievement, Peoria Park District and others. There were over 165 letters of support provided that indicated a leveraging of resources. (pg.2).

Weaknesses

No weaknesses noted.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 1

Technical Review Cover Sheet

Panel Details

Fiscal Year 2019

CFDA/Subprogram 84.215J **Schedule No** 1 **Tier No.** 1

Panel Name FY19 FSCS - 10

Questions

	Points Possible	Points Scored
1. Selection Criteria		
Project Design	15	13
Project Services	25	25
Resources	15	15
Management Plan	20	20
Project Evaluation	25	25
<hr/>		
TOTAL	100	98

Priority Questions

1. Competitive Preference Priority 2		
Competitive Consortiums	1	1
2. Competitive Preference Priority 3		
History Effectiveness	1	1
<hr/>		
TOTAL	2	2
<hr/>		
GRAND TOTAL	102	100

Technical Review Form

Reviewer Name

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—

(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 the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs.

Strengths

1) Goals, objectives and outcomes on table 14 (pp. 27-28) are clearly specified, identify the target population to be served and identify the data collection methods clearly by which the outcomes will be evaluated.

2) It appears that this project is appropriate and will address the needs of the target population.

Weaknesses

3) Given that one of their outcomes is improving student achievement, they could have provided a more detailed presentation of their current student achievement data – for example, they provided state summative test results in ELA and mathematics on pp. 16-17 for the schools in their consortium, and on page 36 mentioned NWEA outcomes, but didn't provide current NWEA data, or mentioned target proficiency scores for state summative test.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 13

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Services

2.

The Secretary considers the quality of the services to be provided by the proposed project. In determining the quality of project services, the Secretary considers the quality and sufficiency of strategies for ensuring equal access and treatment for eligible project participants who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability. In addition, the Secretary considers the following—

(1) The likely impact of the services to be provided by the proposed project on the intended recipients of those services.

(2) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project involve the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project services.

Strengths

Each program service identified is thoughtfully selects to address specific needs. The proposed services will offer a wide range of opportunities that the children and families do not currently have, which include fine arts exposure, individualized learning plan for all students, health and physical fitness, financial literacy, STEM opportunities, among others (Table 17, pp. 36-37).
2) The pipeline services provided by the various collaboration partners, such as AlignPeoria, Hult Health Education Center, Unitypoint – Methodist and others will provide services that this community needs.

Weaknesses

None observed in this section of the application

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 25

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

3.

The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources for the proposed project. In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors—

(1) The relevance and demonstrated commitment of each partner in the proposed project to the implementation and success of the project;

(2) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the number of persons to be served and to the anticipated results and benefits.

Strengths

1) Each partner listed has a demonstrated history of support for the district. Align Peoria, Junior Achievement, Illinois Math Academy, Southside Mission and Peoria Public Library are committed to the project as evidenced by this section of the proposal. District has worked with all of these partners in the past with measurable results. They have also been thoughtful in the selection of the project personnel – Cultures of Caring Coaches/Success Coaches (pp. 43-44). Each program listed in the application has a supporting partner that has identified its support.

2) Not all components of the application need grant funding and will be supported by other means/funding. This demonstrates efficiency and allocation of resources for maximum impact and sustainability. Initial number of students served is 150 but by year 5, the project will support 250 students (p.1, 5)

Weaknesses

None are apparent to this reviewer.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

4.

The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the 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 extent to which the time commitments of the project director and principal investigator and other key project personnel are appropriate and adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project.

Strengths

1) The allocation of resources is well documented and accounted for across the consortium/site. Even custodians' time was factored into the resources because of the afterschool and evening need for resources in the schools (p 70).

2) The work on the project for the project director and PI, and key personnel is narrowed down to three days per week taking into account Monday and Friday conflicts based on data gathered during other projects/initiatives. Well-documented time commitments for each key member of the project team (Table 33, p. 73).

Weaknesses

None observed in this section of the application

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

5.

The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors—

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project.

(2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible.

(3) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes.

Strengths

This is a strong and thorough evaluation plan.

1) The evaluation plan is thorough, with an explanation of how each facet of the project will be evaluated, and is appropriate to the goals, objectives and outcomes of the project.

2) They will work with an independent evaluator whose resume is included (p. 81). They will also employ several evaluation tools.

3) Most of the data that will be collected, apart from the student achievement data provided through NWEA assessments, appears to be qualitative in nature, which will provide a comprehensive profile of the implementation process of the project components (pp. 85-86). Surveys will provide student and family satisfaction data, observations of staff will provide both quantifiable and qualitative data. The triangulation of these data is critical to internal validity and reliability.

Weaknesses

None observed in this section of the application.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 25

Competitive Preference Priority 2 - Broad Competitive Consortiums

1.

Competitive Preference Priority 2

Broad Competitive Consortiums

The Secretary gives priority to an applicant that demonstrates that it is a consortium comprised of a broad representation of stakeholders.

Strengths

Large and broad group of stakeholders in the consortium.

Weaknesses

None observed in this application.

Question Status: Completed

Reviewer Score: 1

Competitive Preference Priority 3 - History Effectiveness

2.

Competitive Preference Priority 3

History Effectiveness

The Secretary gives priority to an applicant that demonstrates that it is a consortium with a history of effectiveness.

Strengths

This consortium has demonstrated their ability to seek out and use funding creatively and productively for the betterment of their students.

Weaknesses

None observed in this application.

Question Status: Completed

Reviewer Score: 1