

Technical Review Cover Sheet

Panel Details

Fiscal Year 2019 **CFDA/Subprogram** 84.215J **Schedule No** 1 **Tier No.** 1

Panel Name FY19 FSCS - 2

Applicant Name New York City Community Learning Schools Initiative **PR/Award No** U215J190097

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**

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 has established two focused and comprehensive goals which are supported by very clear and highly measurable objectives and outcomes. The first goal speaks to the critical task of building and sustaining staff capacity which is so necessary to the success of the project. Comprehensive activities of the goals, objective and outcomes will result in building the knowledge base of the staff in community schools' best practices; supporting the handling of internal and external resources, and promoting increased coordination and integration of pipeline services.

The second goal focuses on the design and implementation of a research- and evidence-based model in order to address the dire needs of students and family and improving academic, socio-emotional and health and mental health for the target population and improved adult job readiness and financial securities. Two objectives and measurable outcomes include: Example 1. Family/Community Objective - Each year of implementation, the number of parents/caregivers who attend at least two family engagement activities will increase by at least 20% over the prior year. Measurable Outcome - At the end of each implementation year, at least 85% of parents will report satisfaction with the services offered through the FSCS initiative at each FSCS target school; and example 2. Student Objective - Each year of implementation, at least 700 students at PS 18, PS 48, and PS 369 will participate in an enrichment after-school program. Student Outcome - At the end of each implementation year, there will be at least a 15% reduction in the number of students suspended or with other disciplinary infractions at each FSCS target school. (p. e27-30, Table 2. p. e27)

2) Having been wisely developed with meaningful and collective input (in the form of needs and resource assessment tools and activities) from the CLS staff of both schools, central office staff, school staff and a wide range of community partners, the design of the proposed project is highly appropriate and guarantees to successfully address the needs of the target population. The judicious purpose of this initial assessment process was to identify areas of unmet needs in the target school communities, to highlight gaps in the pipeline services, to identify existing services that are under-utilized and to offer training services that would build the capacity of FSCS school staff to implement and sustain research-based best practices. (p. e30-32, Table 3, p. e32)

Weaknesses

None 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 services provided by the project are extremely likely to have a strong, positive impact on the intended recipients.

The project pays careful attention to providing high quality and sufficient strategies for ensuring that the intended recipients who are members of underrepresented groups receive equal access and treatment to all programs, activities and services throughout the project. Those strategies include, but not limited to ensuring accessibility to students, family and community with disabilities, alleviating barriers to access of parents, providing career and workforce services to parents, supports to families in temporary housing, and translating program materials in the other languages as needed. (p. e36-38)

The services to be offered were developed in response to explicit student, family, school, and community needs and gaps in service delivery at the target schools, and therefore are expected to have a highly significant and positive impact on the intended recipients. Those services that support the identified need areas include high quality early learning, high quality in-school and out-of-school programs, educational transitions, family and community engagement, workforce and job readiness, social, health, nutrition and mental health services, and juvenile crime prevention and rehabilitation. (p. e38-61)

2)) The CLS/NYC DOE consortium is supported by 19 appropriate and committed partners, including city agencies, community-based organizations, and medical and mental health providers, who are collaborating and committed to providing a wide range of needed services that are aligned with the goals and objectives. Those services and supports include: counseling to identify students for targeted interventions who need ongoing individual supportive services and will respond to mental health crisis situations as they arise; and health program to collaborate on

school events, such as parent-teacher conferences, Career Day, health center enrollment initiatives, and behavioral health clinician meetings with teachers and to provide medical, mental health, vision, and dental services; that together given the level of supports, strong commitment and intensity of services will maximize the effectiveness of the project. (p. e61-64, Table 6, Appendix-Letters of Support)

Weaknesses

None 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 partners in the project demonstrate full commitment to the implementation and success of the project in the varied areas such as evaluation services, reading curriculum, tutoring, food pantries, counseling services, job and workforce readiness, and out-of-school time. The partners provide MOU's and letters of support. (p. e65-73, Appendix-Letters of Support, MOU)

2) The costs appear fully reasonable in relation to the number of persons to be served and to the anticipated results and benefits. The year one grant award requested is \$475,00 to serving 1250 students calculates to \$380 per student in year one, which appears reasonable. The applicant has provided convincing and detailed explanation of all budget areas that the costs are true and reasonable to support the achievement of the objectives of the project for the target population. The budget supports the project design to promote achievement of objectives through comprehensive planning and coordination of FSCS pipeline services, supports, and activities that will ensure the appropriate intensity of program effort and benefits. (p. e65-73, Appendix-Community Learning Schools Toolkit, Itemized Budget Summary)

Weaknesses

None 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 plan is beyond adequate to achieve the objectives of the project on time and within budget.

The key responsible persons, CLS, are already onboard and bring a demonstrated track record in expertise, professional capacity and resources to the management of the FSCS project.

Responsibilities and qualifications are clearly defined for each staff person. Further, the applicant places a high value on staff development that is key to making profound and lasting school improvements for the benefit of students. For example, FSCS staff must participate in training sessions to get in-depth training on the CLS history model and must participate in an annual performance evaluation process related to the work the staff members need to do to support community school implementation. Key project staff participate in CLS professional development which offers a multi-layered, research- and evidence-based, self-directed learning model. Community school directors are further supported by a full day of monthly professional learning sessions which are complemented by a Community Learning School Toolkit. In addition, CLS will offer monthly after-school professional learning opportunities for the School Advisory Board / Community School Teams for all of its Community Learning Schools. This wide and encompassing range of professional learning opportunities will give all responsible personnel and partners an opportunity to build their content knowledge and improve their professional capacity to do what is necessary to achieve the objectives of the proposed project.

The application provides a table (Table 8) with a clearly defined timeline of key implementation milestones, including the persons and/or partners responsible, for planning, management, service delivery, and project evaluation.

All of these factors together are fully expected to enable the objectives to be successfully achieved on time and within budget. (p.e73-83, Table 8, Appendix-Community Learning Schools Toolkit, Itemized Budget Summary)

2) The time commitments of the project director and other key project personnel are entirely appropriate and fully adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project. A thorough review of resumes, job qualifications and requirements, roles and responsibilities, professional development to be offered and FTE time commitments are the personnel synergy adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project. (p. e99- 101, Table 9, Appendix-Community Learning Schools Toolkit, Itemized Budget Summary)

Weaknesses

None 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 methods of evaluation to be conducted by an external evaluator are fully anticipated to be thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project. The evaluator has a documented history of over 40 years in successfully conducting evaluations for a wide range of federally-funded educational program evaluations and research projects. For this project, the evaluation will use a multi-method approach, thoroughly including both formative and summative components, and collecting data from a variety of qualitative and quantitative sources, to ensure thorough and accurate responses to determine the extent to which project objectives and outcomes have been met. (p. e101-104, Logic Model)

2) The methods of evaluation and sources of data will produce quantitative and qualitative data that fully assess project outcomes relative to the objective performance measures. Specific and thorough evaluation processes relative to data sources, methods, evaluation tools, and analysis

have been clearly defined and detailed for each of the two overarching goals in order to produce high quality quantitative and qualitative data using objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project. (p. e104-110)

3)The application provides a table (Table 9) that details the data sources, methods and data collection for evaluation of the goals and measurable outcomes. The evaluation team will analyze qualitative and quantitative data and review evaluation findings and results in order to produce an annual performance report that is highly valid and reliable. (p. e110-115, Table 9)

Weaknesses

None 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 CPP2 is met. The applicant has a consortium comprised of a broad representation of stakeholders, including city agencies, community-based organizations, and medical and mental health Providers, and additionally will use the services of an external evaluator. (p. e115-116)

Weaknesses

None 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

Competitive preference priority 3 is met. The applicant is a consortium beginning in 2012-2013 with one cohort of six schools and has grown to a total of five cohorts with 31 schools, most of which have improved in English language arts and mathematics. Other areas of effective progress include increased teacher awareness of students making improvements, and in meeting "key preconditions" for student learning and success. (p. e20, 117-122)

Weaknesses

None 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 - 2

Applicant Name New York City Community Learning Schools Initiative **PR/Award No** U215J190097

Questions

Points Possible**Points Scored**

1. Selection Criteria

Project Design	15	15
Project Services	25	24
Resources	15	14
Management Plan	20	19
Project Evaluation	25	25

TOTAL	100	97
--------------	------------	-----------

Priority Questions

1. Competitive Preference Priority 2

Competitive Consortia	1	1
-----------------------	---	---

2. Competitive Preference Priority 3

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

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

GRAND TOTAL	102	99
--------------------	------------	-----------

Technical Review Form

Applicant Name New York City Community Learning Schools Initiative **PR/Award No** U215J190097

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 goals, objectives and outcomes are clearly defined and measurable, and include process objectives with measurable outcomes for each objective in Table 2, (e27-30). For example, Goal 1 is to develop the capacity of target school staff to build and sustain the FSCS model during and beyond the federal funding period. An objective is that each year of implementation, the CSDs at each FSCS will establish and convene the Advisory Boards at least monthly to guide and inform the design, implementation, and assessment of the FSCS initiative at the school level. The outcome for this objective is that at the end of each implementation year, at least 85% of Advisory Board members will report increased service coordination through the work of the CSD and a sense of shared ownership of the FSCS model in their schools, (e27).

The design of the project demonstrates that it will successfully address the needs of the target population or other needs. The project was designed with input from staff at the district and school levels, a wide range of community partners, including an external evaluator (e30), with the goal to identify service gaps, needs in the areas of student performance, underutilization of services, and capacity supports for the proposed community schools, (e31). For example at PS 18 existing services include high quality OST programming, but there was a need for social, health, nutrition, and mental health supports, (e31). To meet those needs new funding will support parent workshops about physical and mental health and wellness provided by school staff and outside vendors, family wellness nights, and expanding the school garden at this community school, (e52).

Weaknesses

None identified.

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

Because of its diverse population the applicant describes its policies and commitment to providing equal access to services (e37.) to the entire community. There are plans to translate materials into Spanish, and additional languages as needed through the use of parent volunteers (e.g. Arabic, Bengali, Slovak, Niger-Congo, Soninke, and/or French at PS 18, e38), this ensures that information about the project will be effectively communicated to parents and increases the likelihood that the services will reach and impact the intended recipients.

The services included in the project plan are coordinated at the school and initiative levels which will maximize the effectiveness of project services. Each service pipeline includes appropriate partners that can provide high quality services to support students and families. For example, at PS 48 they have collaborated with multiple OST partners to provide a continuum of youth development and academic opportunities for students including literacy, sports, health and fitness, and social-worker led groups that target Social Emotional Learning (SEL), (e47). These services, which reach more than 300 students at the school, will have a positive impact that helps the project achieve its goal to improve academic, social-emotional, and health and mental health outcomes for participating students and family and community members, (e28).

Weaknesses

The applicant notes that English Language Learners comprise 23% of the population at PS 48, 32% of the population at PS 18, and 44% of the population at PS 369 (e25-7), yet does not state how academic interventions like Literacy Trust and Reading Rescue are adaptable/suitable for English Language Learners (e22-23). The overall impact of services will be limited if academic interventions are not adaptable for English Language Learners, a significant portion of the population.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 24

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

Partners' commitment to the project is demonstrated, in part, by in-kind contributions ranging from between \$148k to \$210k for salaries (e57), and \$12,000 per year for program supplies and in-kind services from some partners. For example, Positive Learning Collaborative is providing \$15,000 in in-kind supervision and data analysis services, (e66). Additionally, commitment to the proposed project by the lead partners, the school district and the New York City Community Learning Schools Initiative, can be seen in the MOU which includes commitments from each partner to participate in joint professional development and a Shared Accountability subsection reinforcing the commitment and relevance of each organization to the success of the project. (e127).

Weaknesses

The costs for the project are generally reasonable, however while the description of costs includes "approximately 1,250 students in grades 3K through 5 will be served by the project each year" (e16), no approximate target is set for the number of family members to be served, though they are identified as a population who will receive services (e16). This makes it difficult to fully assess the reasonableness of costs without at least the number of students and number of family members to be served.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 14

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 is adequate and provides a framework for meeting project goals on time and within budget. They provide an implementation timeline which includes milestones, frequency of the activity, and people responsible, (e95). It includes key opportunities for assessing the progress of the project and making adjustments as necessary, for example an FSCS Consortium Steering Committee will meet quarterly for the duration of the grant to guide and inform design,

implementation, and assessment (e95), and a quarterly meeting of the Project Director and Director of Program Support to conduct grant management and monitoring of deliverables and spending, (e97). Evaluation activities and service delivery activities are also included in the timeline, (e97-99).

In general, the time commitments of key personnel are adequate and appropriate for the activities proposed, the Project Director is .2FTE, and the Community School Directors are 1.0 FTE at each school, (e100-101)

Weaknesses

The program manager responsible for supervision from CLS to the Community School Directors is 0.2FTE (e100), and that time allocation does not increase over the years as more CSDs are brought on, nor does it account for her partnership development responsibilities weekly school meetings, and professional development she'll be providing to the 3 advisory committees, (e83). The 0.2FTE does not appear to be adequate given the breadth of responsibilities. Additionally, absent proper supervision of CSD, meeting objectives of proposed project will be at risk.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 19

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 for the evaluation are feasible, thorough, and appropriate to the goals, objectives and outcomes of the project. The applicants have identified an external evaluation partner (e101), and the evaluation uses a multi-method approach to assess quantitative objectives and the impact on students, adult family and community members, (e102). The evaluation will assess whether the project is meeting the goals, objectives, and performance measures identified in Table 2 (e27-30). The proposal provides examples of participation that will be reviewed: afterschool programming,

adult education services, job training/workforce readiness programs, coaching and training, (e102).

Methods for this evaluation will include a review of participation data in student services, family services, and professional development services, as well as document review (e.g. reviewing minutes from steering committee meetings), surveys of stakeholders, analysis of student level performance data, and site visits/focus groups to collect qualitative data. The methods are aligned with objective performance measures and will provide quantitative and qualitative data that is valid, reliable, and relevant, (e105-109). Table 9 provides an overview of each measurable outcome and the data and sources that will be used to evaluate performance, (e110-114).

Weaknesses

None identified.

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

A broadly representative consortium of stakeholders provided letters of support and commitment for CLS in this application (e129-146)

Weaknesses

None identified.

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 consortium has worked together to implement community schools from 2014-2017, an evaluation of those community schools showed evidence of effectiveness including improvements in academics and attendance (e119-120).

Weaknesses

None identified.

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 - 2

Applicant Name New York City Community Learning Schools Initiative **PR/Award No** U215J190097

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 New York City Community Learning Schools Initiative **PR/Award No** U215J190097

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 presents goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project that are clearly specified and measurable (pp. e27-e30, e105, e110-114). For example, the applicant states that one goal is to develop the capacity of target school staff to build and sustain the FSCS model during and beyond the federal funding period and further refines the goal by setting objectives such as “each year of implementation, CLS will convene the FSCS consortium Steering Committee on a quarterly basis to guide and inform the design, implementation, and assessment of the FSCS initiative.” The applicant then provides a metric for making goal and objective measurable (“at the end of each implementation year, at least 80% of FSCS team school staff will report increased knowledge of best practices in Community Schools implementation”). The objective sets a concrete, numerical target and specifies to whom the objective pertains and when the data will be collected.

The applicant presents a project design that is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs (pp. e32, e38-e42, e44-e59). For example, the Reading Rescue program is an evidenced-based program that will be expanded in response to the need to increase reading scores on assessments. Likewise, the unemployment rate in the target population is twice the rate of all of New York City. The partnership with the East Side House Settlement aims to address the unemployment issue.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses found (no pages).

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 has proposed a project with services that are likely to have a positive impact on the intended recipients of those services (pp. e27-e30, e38-e59). The measurable outcomes will aid in program monitoring and continuous quality improvement such that the applicant will be able to track progress and make any necessary changes (pp. e27-e30). Further, the applicant is using program backed by research that has shown positive results in the past such as the Pre-K for All units of study (p. e39), Job-Plus (p. e50), and Reading Rescue (e38).

The applicant has assembled an impressive list of partners that are appropriate for maximizing the effectiveness of project services (e38-e59, e61-e64). For example, Corbin Hill not only provides fresh foods and vegetable for students and families, they also offer a school garden as a space for experiential learning (p. e140).

Weaknesses

No weaknesses found (no pages).

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 proposed partners demonstrate their commitment and relevance to the project through the MOU (pp. e126-e128) and letters of support (pp. e129-e146). Key partners have also pledged time to the project in the form of regularly scheduled meetings (p. e79). Partners will also provide in-kind contributions that are relevant to the success and implementation of the project such as supporting staff, providing facilities, programmatic materials, and fingerprinting (pp. e65-e68, e100-e101).

The costs are reasonable in relation to the number of persons to be served and to the anticipated results and benefits. The applicant is requesting \$2.4 million over five years to serve approximately 1250 students and their families a year (p.e7, e16). The federal request, non-federal

funds, and in-kind contributions make the budget sufficient for the applicant to achieve the anticipated results and benefits.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses found (no pages).

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 presents management plan that is adequate and well-crafted to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks (pp. e35, e38, e42-e44, e73-e85). Management plan assets include having a protocol and timeline for onboarding, monthly Advisory Board meetings, and planned professional development. Responsibilities are clarified responsibilities for example the distinctions drawn between the individual and shared responsibilities of the principal and community school director (p. e207). A timeline is presented that lays out an orderly process for implementation assigning discreet tasks to persons and partners and describing when the activities should take place (pp. e95-e99). The management plan's strength will minimize inefficiencies that might negatively impact the budget.

The time commitments of the project director and other key project personnel are appropriate and adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project. The project director will dedicate .20 FTE to managing the project. The Community School Directors will devote 50-100% of their time to the project.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses found (no pages).

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 thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project (pp. e101-e115). The applicant proposes to conduct formative and summative evaluations using mix-methods. Information will obtain through document review, administrative data, and primary data collection. The proposed plan is sufficient for measuring the extent to which the applicant achieves the desired goals, objectives, and outcomes.

The applicant clearly demonstrates the alignment of performance measures and intended outcomes (pp. e27-e30). For example, the logic model draws lines from activities and resources to intended outcomes, both long and short term (p. e105). Further, the data sources indicated by the applicant will produce quantitative (e.g., school assessment data) and qualitative (e.g., site visits).

The applicant will have both school administrative and primary data on relevant outcomes. The data collected will have multiple sources and perspectives increasing the likelihood of valid and reliable performance data. (pp. e101-e115).

Weaknesses

No weaknesses found (no pages).

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 presents a broadly representative consortium of educators including the United Federation of Teachers (UFT), the Partnership for New York City, the New York City Council, Trinity Wall Street, the New York City Department of Education (NYCDOE) (pp. e16, e19).

Weaknesses

No weaknesses found (no pages).

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

Members of the consortium have a history of effectiveness working together including growing from six schools to 31 in six years, reporting demonstrated improvement in student academic performance, alleviating basic needs of families, and connecting students and families to services (pp. e20, e100-e122).

Weaknesses

No weaknesses found (no pages).

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 - 2

Applicant Name New York City Community Learning Schools Initiative **PR/Award No** U2151190097

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 New York City Community Learning Schools Initiative **PR/Award No** U215J190097

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 presents goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project that are clearly specified and measurable (pp. e27-e30, e105, e110-114). For example, the applicant states that one goal is to develop the capacity of target school staff to build and sustain the FSCS model during and beyond the federal funding period and further refines the goal by setting objectives such as “each year of implementation, CLS will convene the FSCS consortium Steering Committee on a quarterly basis to guide and inform the design, implementation, and assessment of the FSCS initiative.” The applicant then provides a metric for making goal and objective measurable (“at the end of each implementation year, at least 80% of FSCS team school staff will report increased knowledge of best practices in Community Schools implementation”). The objective sets a concrete, numerical target and specifies to whom the objective pertains and when the data will be collected.

The applicant presents a project design that is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs (pp. e32, e38-e42, e44-e59). For example,

the Reading Rescue program is an evidenced-based program that will be expanded in response to the need to increase reading scores on assessments. Likewise, the unemployment rate in the target population is twice the rate of all of New York City. The partnership with the East Side House Settlement aims to address the unemployment issue.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses found (no pages).

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 has proposed a project with services that are likely to have a positive impact on the intended recipients of those services (pp. e27-e30, e38-e59). The measurable outcomes will aid in program monitoring and continuous quality improvement such that the applicant will be able to track progress and make any necessary changes (pp. e27-e30). Further, the applicant is using program backed by research that has shown positive results in the past such as the Pre-K for All units of study (p. e39), Job-Plus (p. e50), and Reading Rescue (e38).

The applicant has assembled an impressive list of partners that are appropriate for maximizing the effectiveness of project services (e38-e59, e61-e64). For example, Corbin Hill not only provides fresh foods and vegetable for students and families, they also offer a school garden as a space for experiential learning (p. e140).

Weaknesses

No weaknesses found (no pages).

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 proposed partners demonstrate their commitment and relevance to the project through the MOU (pp. e126-e128) and letters of support (pp. e129-e146). Key partners have also pledged time to the project in the form of regularly scheduled meetings (p. e79). Partners will also provide in-kind contributions that are relevant to the success and implementation of the project such as supporting staff, providing facilities, programmatic materials, and fingerprinting (pp. e65-e68, e100-e101).

The costs are reasonable in relation to the number of persons to be served and to the anticipated results and benefits. The applicant is requesting \$2.4 million over five years to serve approximately 1250 students and their families a year (p.e7, e16). The federal request, non-federal funds, and in-kind contributions make the budget sufficient for the applicant to achieve the anticipated results and benefits.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses found (no pages).

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 presents management plan that is adequate and well-crafted to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks (pp. e35, e38, e42-e44, e73-e85). Management plan assets include having a protocol and timeline for onboarding, monthly Advisory Board meetings, and planned professional development. Responsibilities are clarified responsibilities for example the distinctions drawn between the individual and shared responsibilities of the principal and community school director (p. e207). A timeline is presented that lays out an orderly process for implementation assigning discreet tasks to persons and partners and describing when the activities should take place (pp. e95-e99). The management plan's strength will minimize inefficiencies that might negatively impact the budget.

The time commitments of the project director and other key project personnel are appropriate and adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project. The project director will dedicate .20 FTE to managing the project. The Community School Directors will devote 50-100% of their time to the project.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses found (no pages).

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 thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project (pp. e101-e115). The applicant proposes to conduct formative and summative evaluations using mix-methods. Information will obtain through document review, administrative data, and primary data collection. The proposed plan is sufficient for measuring the extent to which the applicant achieves the desired goals, objectives, and outcomes.

The applicant clearly demonstrates the alignment of performance measures and intended outcomes (pp. e27-e30). For example, the logic model draws lines from activities and resources to intended outcomes, both long and short term (p. e105). Further, the data sources indicated by the applicant will produce quantitative (e.g., school assessment data) and qualitative (e.g., site visits).

The applicant will have both school administrative and primary data on relevant outcomes. The data collected will have multiple sources and perspectives increasing the likelihood of valid and reliable performance data. (pp. e101-e115).

Weaknesses

No weaknesses found (no pages).

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 presents a broadly representative consortium of educators including the United Federation of Teachers (UFT), the Partnership for New York City, the New York City Council, Trinity Wall Street, the New York City Department of Education (NYCDOE) (pp. e16, e19).

Weaknesses

No weaknesses found (no pages).

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

Members of the consortium have a history of effectiveness working together including growing from six schools to 31 in six years, reporting demonstrated improvement in student academic performance, alleviating basic needs of families, and connecting students and families to services (pp. e20, e100-e122).

Weaknesses

No weaknesses found (no pages).

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 1

