

Technical Review Cover Sheet

Panel Details

Fiscal Year 2019 **CFDA/Subprogram** 84.215J **Schedule No** 1 **Tier No.** 1
Panel Name FY19 FSCS - 6

Applicant Name Cook County School District 104 **PR/Award No** U215J190043

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
<hr/>		
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**

Applicant Name Cook County School District 104 **PR/Award No** U215J190043

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

- The project clearly articulates the goals of the program paired with goals that are directly matched to the activities outlined in the objectives. For example, the goals aligned to developing a systemic culture of collaboration (p. 22) has a set of clear indicators to measure success, such as miles for the formation of collaborative educator teams and measurement tools to assess the validity of the programming (p. 139).

- The goals are designed to implement full-service wrap around programs specifically targeted for underserved communities in poverty to increase attendance rates (p.27) and to improve academic outcomes. The overall project design is anticipated to meet this population, specifically as the primary service schools are Title 1 schools in Chicago.

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

- The program includes specific strategies to ensure equal access through recruitment, monitoring, and active engagement of stakeholders (p. 41).
- Access to the intended services by the target populations are clear in the proposal, primarily because the target populations are connected with the schools and are specifically identified as the direct recipient of the services (e.g students, parents, teachers - p. 27).
- There are a number of internal controls designed to assess the quality of the project services, including but not limited to survey design, academic outcomes (through pre and post assessment).
- Collaboration between partners are consistently articulated throughout the proposal, including but not limited to professional development sequences for parents and educators, clearly outlined engagement strategies (e.g. resource centers with family workshops).

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

- The applicants demonstrate a clear commitment to the programming design, including the provision of appropriate staff with expertise to ensure the efficacy of programming.
- Partner lists with relevant commitment (p 99) articulate the clear responsibilities of each stakeholders and the areas of overlap for their activities. For example, The Leadershop (p. 104) has provided ongoing community services for over 15 years to the Summit School District and clearly articulates after-school programming emphasizing integrating the arts).
- The costs presented by the applicants are reasonable, considering the scope of the services being provide, the provision of full-time site coordinators at each site, relative to the number of persons served. There are 1,250 students, 50 teachers, and 1,000 family members to be served at a cost of \$217 students, teachers, or parents (p. 110). With in-kind resources at \$241,068 or 48% on the average in-kind match (p. 110).

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

- The management plan and structure encompasses a number of different stakeholders that have specific responsibilities with clear measures of their activity success, which demonstrate reliability in achieving the outcomes of the grant (p. 61-64).
- The milestones are clear, with clear project initialization dates, completion dates, success metrics, and accountability for the proposed scope of projects. For example, the academic enrichment scope (p. 62) includes the dosage, frequency, and connected outcomes with metrics aligned to the executive function skills taught during this tutoring hour.

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

- The methods of evaluation are clear, research-based, and provide clear comparative analysis of what they hope to achieve. For example, a number of the academic interventions are designed to demonstrate a statistically significant increase in performance, as evidenced by the power analysis for the sample size (p. 130).
- The methods of evaluation are research-tested and externally validated instruments that have a basis in prior project initiatives.
- The mixed methods approach also employs a number of qualitative features, such as observation instruments, focus groups, etc. (p. 129)

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 applicants are representative of a number of different community partners directly targeting a range of different stakeholders through articulated pipeline services.
- The applicants comprise a broad representation of stakeholders for three low income, Title 1 community schools in south suburban Chicago.
- The target population includes students, teachers, and parents over the duration of the grants.

Weaknesses

N/A

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 applicants draw on both the internal programming data (p.4) as indicators of academic achievement correlated to the Unidos program and is modeled after a full service community program on the south side of Chicago, servicing a similar population of stakeholders.

Weaknesses

N/A

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 - 6

Applicant Name Cook County School District 104 **PR/Award No** U215J190043

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
<hr/>		
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 Cook County School District 104 **PR/Award No** U215J190043

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

The applicant designed their goals to be SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-related; e39), including a list of quantitative performance measures (e156-e158). Objectives and outcomes and time lines for each objective are presented by the applicant (e39-e44) and are clearly specified and measurable.

The applicant chose to target schools with a high percentage of students who are limited English proficient or have low reading scores (e44) and no current coordinated supports (e47). The applicant plans to build partnerships and teams (e47) to better target interventions. The applicant also reports a lack of high-quality early childhood education programs (e48), which Unidos will address through providing professional development of early childhood educators and parent mentors, workshops and coaching for parents provided by the early childhood educators and parent mentors and expand early childhood home visits (e48-e49). The applicant reports a need for high-quality in- and out-of-school programming, and they plan to provide professional development each year to teachers to improve in-school programming (e50-e51). Unidos staff and community partners will offer out-of-school programming (e51). The applicant plans to address the lack of transition programs, by creating an early warning system to target at-risk students and provide academic monitoring, counseling, and support services (e52-e53). The applicant plans to address the paucity of family and community engagement and supports by offering weekly activities focusing on children and families (e52-e53), establishing family resource centers at community sites (e54), teaming up parent leader/mentor teams with project staff (e54), providing family nights focused on: family and parent engagement and education to enhance family and parental development (e55), and providing academic support classes to support parents (e55). To combat the need for social, health, nutrition, and mental health services, the applicant plans to use evidence-based strategies to bolster socio-emotional needs (e56), connect students with available health and mental health services (e57), and provide healthier food and workshops on choosing and growing healthy foods (e57). Each of these elements help to successfully address population needs.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses found.

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

The applicant intends to develop a collaborative implementation system and a collaborative culture of support (e59-e60), high quality early childhood education programs (e63-e64), train early childhood educators and parent leader/mentors (e64-e67), improved in and out-of-school programming (e70-e84), developed transition programs for students moving from elementary to middle school, middle school to high school, and high school to postsecondary education (e84-e85), and provide an early warning system for at-risk students (e85-e86). The likely impact is eased transitions from elementary to middle school, middle school to high school, and high school to college; as well as providing students with a greater level of support through teachers and parents, and catching at-risk students and providing appropriate services.

Partners were paired with services to maximize appropriate resources and experience (e110-e114). The MOUs detail the collaboration of partners (e181-e206). The partners (i.e., a school system with high need and community and healthcare organizations) are appropriate for a project combining early childhood education, parent outreach, and health and other services. Since these organizations each have experience and specialize in different aspects of the project the combination of partners will maximize effectiveness of the project.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses found.

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

The MOU details the commitment of partners (e181-e206). In table 4, the applicant describes partners' relevance to the project and aspects of demonstrated commitment (e116-e126). For example, The LeaderShop has been providing community services to the region since 2001 and will provide staff, materials and space for implementing authentic learning in school and out-of-school-time programming (e121).

The applicant estimates the cost to be around \$217 for each person served by the consortium each year (e127). This cost is reasonable for the amount of services provided.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses found.

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

The applicant clearly describes typical duties of project personnel, including the Leadership Team, Project Management Team, Unidos School Site Coordination Teams, school principals, and community partners (e129-131). The applicant further ties project roles to objectives and timelines in table 3 (e132-138). This appropriate level of planning and organization will aid in the successful completion of project tasks and milestones because it will keep the project on time and on budget.

The Project Director and one coordinator are budgeted at 50% FTE while other key project personnel have budgeted a substantial (i.e., 60% or more FTE) proportion of time to work on the project (e139), which is appropriate in a project with this many facets.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses found.

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

The program evaluation is thorough, including summative evaluation, formative evaluation, pretest/posttest, and qualitative pieces, including interviews, focus groups, e-portfolio, reports, journals, and syllabi (e146-e147). The applicant has also already calculated the power for the school sample size to make sure it is adequate for their needs (e147). The project used previously established instruments whenever available and an external evaluator to develop all new instruments (with a goal of validity and reliability coefficients of at least .80; e147).

The applicant has connected parts of the evaluation to each of their goals and objectives (e150) and is using a mixed method design that includes a quasi-experimental design study (e150) as well as qualitative data collection.

Quantitative measures were chosen from valid and reliable measures previously used such as attendance records, DIBELS (e156), Illinois state tests (objective 3; e156-e158), academic records

(objective 4; e159), attendance records (objective 5), FITness Gram or Brockport Physical fitness tests (objective 6; e161).

Weaknesses

No weaknesses found.

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 consortium includes community partners in education, mental health, and a community high school (Argo) (e19).

Weaknesses

No weaknesses found.

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 school district and its partners has previously run a Full Service Community Program (e20-e21) and that FSCP had both academic (increased scores in reading and mathematics; e20) and non-academic (e23-e24).

Weaknesses

No weaknesses found.

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 - 6

Applicant Name Cook County School District 104 **PR/Award No** U215J190043

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 Cook County School District 104 **PR/Award No** U215J190043

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

Review of the key goals, objectives, and the proposed activities as discussed by the applicant are clearly measurable. The applicant included well identified key goals and objectives for this project with proposed outcomes and timelines. Included was the cross reference to the Evaluation measures, indicators. As well, the project will focus on 5 pipeline services. The applicant provided a cross reference to the evaluation plan which listed the measures, indicators of assessment for each one of the outcomes that were listed. (pp.e39-44)

The applicant proposes to address the needs of the target audience creating collaborations in the community and by forging partnerships between schools, families and community services providers in order to be able to better service target population in these communities. The applicant also proposes to provide high-quality innovative approaches to addressing the needs of the target population such as with early childhood education, lack of high quality in-school and out-of-schools programming, and lack of family and community engagement. A value-added feature that served to better explain and justify their approach to proposed solutions was by specifically discussing the need(s) and then follow-up with a detailed discussion of how the proposed intervention(s) would address the needs. By using this approach, it is clear to see the appropriate alignment between needs and intervention services and programs. (pp. e47-e56)

Weaknesses

No weakness 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

One of the guiding principles for the applicant is promote equitable participation and access to services. The applicant, as stated, is committed to diversity in the projects it carries out as well as in the partnerships it engages in.

Based on the applicant's extensive discussion of the impact and projected timelines that each one of the interventions, activities and/or programs would have, it is evident that proposed project will have significant impact. As an example, the applicant proposes to: (pp. e60-108

- Develop a researched-based Collaborative Implementation System among the Consortium's 24 members Leadership Team of partners to ensure that a system of ongoing support and coordination is in place for the Unidos project. The Leadership Team will meet regularly to ensure ongoing project support.
- Develop and implement a high-quality early childhood education program to instill lifelong learning for parents as well as their children.
- Provide researched-based Professional Development for Early Childhood Educators, Parent Leaders/Mentor Leaders to work with parents how they can foster social, behavioral and self-regulations skills focusing children's behavior and developing age-appropriate communication skills keeping in mind the history and values of the family.

It is evident that the thoughtful and intentional design of the project is to work collaboratively with its partners as reflected in the MOU that outlines commitments. Roles and responsibilities are clearly identified in relevant areas throughout the application. Example -Project leadership team, composed of 9 community partners, 3 teachers 3 Site Coordinators and 3 school principals will meet every month for 2 hours to review the overall effectiveness of a partner contributions based on formative and summative evaluations with results to consider how partner collaboration within and across pipeline services could be improved. (pp. e108-109) and MOU.

Weaknesses

No Weakness 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 relevance and demonstrated commitment of each partner in the proposed project to the implementation and success of the project;

The MOU provides relevant commitment and the support provided by of each partner. The applicant also included a comprehensive table that demonstrates each partner's relevant experience and background aligned to the pipeline services objectives for which they are committed. As well, the table addresses each partner's background and experiences related to the services for which they are committed to providing. Further, each partner has made a major commitment and pledged substantial resources to support the effective implementation of the project such as commitments that included staff, materials, and space to host events and workshops. (pp.e116-126)

(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.

The costs estimate represent services that will be provided each year to 1,250 students, 50 teachers, and 1000 family members. The project costs, which are reasonable, are approximately \$217 per student, teachers and parents served each year the grant.

In justifying the reasonableness of proposed costs, the applicant provided examples such as teachers receiving over 50 hours of professional development training over the five-year project period and 1250 students benefitting from out-of-school time programs focused on arts education, physical fitness and health, nutrition, and social and emotional and mental health.

Also, it is important to note that the applicant plans to establish an infrastructure to continue federal funding after the grant ends by providing seed money for the creation of major teams for leadership, professional development, and instruction which proposes to create a continued relationship between project partners. (pp. e110-128)

Weaknesses

No weakness 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 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.

The proposed structure for managing the project highly supports applicant achieving project goals and objectives on budget and within budget. The table (Unidos Pipeline Services Addressed by Community Partners) provided clearly defines the responsibilities, objectives components, and activities under pipelines services for each partner. (pp. e110-126)

The applicant proposed developing three different management teams for ensuring timeliness of meeting and addressing the project's leadership, planning, management, coordination, and oversight. Each team -Leadership team, Management team, and the School-Base Teacher Professional Development team has clearly defined responsibilities. Other evidential information provided that supports the timeliness of their ability meet proposed project objectives in a timely manner includes the detailed table -Management by Objectives Chart Organized by Objectives - which includes the following: objectives with number of hours and number participants, activities, milestones, timelines, and responsible partner. (pp. e132-1138)

(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.

- Personnel are qualified based on review of qualifications included in key personnel narrative and resumes. (pp. e141-145)
- The Project Director (50% time) has nearly 20 years of experience in the field and has served as a teacher, program director administrator, and curriculum director.
- The Principal Investigator (500 hours annually) has over 40 years of experience as a researcher and evaluator.
- The job description for the School Programs Coordinators is adequate for proposed services and responsibilities.
- The table outlining key personnel by Pipeline Services and % of time allocated further supports appropriateness of time commitment. (pp. e140-141)

Weaknesses

:
No weakness 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 extent to which the methods of evaluation are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project.

The evaluation methods proposed by the project to determine the extent to which objectives have been met annually are through a summative assessment, and how the implementation of the project can improve is through a formative session. Goals, milestones, and timelines will be set annually and reviewed to the extent to which the project activities are meeting the objectives.

- Qualitative assessments include interviews, focus groups, electronic portfolios, course materials are a few examples.
- Further, examples of summative quantitative measures included were pre-post assessment measures, observation instruments, attendance data, and student standardize test scores. The applicant proposes to establish Validity and Reliability of assessment instruments for which the external evaluator will develop and pilot.
- The applicant proposes to evaluate using quasi-experimental design with comparison groups in order to rule out alternative explanations for the results achieved. The application provided sound information/details as to how that process would be conducted. (pp. e150-151)

This method is feasible, and appropriate based on the detail description how this will be accomplished. Also, proposed is the establishment of a central database that keep track of all qualitative data which is a novel approach to data collection and maintenance. (pp. e146-151)

Through formative assessments, the project will provide ongoing feedback on how the project can be continually refined and improved. Finally, the project's website will enable the project to continually share the accomplishments across the schools and the community partners in order to fully engage school and community resources. (pp.e128-129)

(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.

The applicant provided a table that clearly demonstrates the alignment of outcomes and performance measures for each project objective. The table states the outcomes and aligns the outcomes with the performance measures and the timeline. Pp.-e152-153)

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

The applicant presents a well laid out/detailed and descriptive table (Aligned Outcomes and Objective Performance by Program Objective) that address outcomes and performance measures by project each objective that will more than likely yield valid and reliable performance data. (pp. e152-163)

For instance:

- Objective 2: Developing and implementing high quality early childhood education.
Outcome: Early childhood education visits will have increased the ability of parents, at a statistically significant level, to provide effective and early childhood education in the home.
Performance measure: By September 30 of each project year, 80% of Unidos parents, according to reliable and valid pre and post surveys that they will have inducted effective early childhood home support (as measured by a 5-point scale from never using a practice to using the practice almost daily) at a statistically significant .05 level with effect sizes at least .25SD in contrast to comparison schools.

Weaknesses

No weakness added.

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

As provided by the applicant, there are 9 community partners that represent the consortium and these partners provide services for all of the 5 pipeline areas, and the community partners contribute in a variety of ways to accomplish the projects' 6 objectives and it's 5 core program services.

A detailed description of all the representative services for the community partners is included in the attachments. (p. e19)

The MOU, as well as, letters of support are included in the attachments.

Weaknesses

No weakness 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 provided evidence that supported having a history of effectiveness in this area. A few tables that demonstrate results were shared as well. A pre/post quasi-experimental design in Summer School District impacted student achievement in math and reading. The Summit School district and their community partners have established the history of effectiveness and implementing a full-service community project which included school and out-of-school time services, early childhood

programming, Family Services, and health, nutrition, fitness and social emotional community agency interventions. (pp.e13-24)

Weaknesses

No weakness noted.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 1