

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** Teachers College, Columbia University    **PR/Award No** U215J190068

---

Questions

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

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** Teachers College, Columbia University **PR/Award No** U215J190068

**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) Clearly defined goals and objectives, and each objective has an attached outcome, For example, on p. e36, the application states Objective 2 under Goal 1, which is to increase student achievement through improved instruction and targeted expanded learning opportunities, that the number of 2nd grade students at PS36 reading on grade level upon entry to 3rd grade will increase by 5% each year of the grant, as evidenced by running records, so that by year 5 25% more students will be reading at grade level.

2) 6 existing and expanded pipeline services will provide a continuum of support for the duration of the grant cycle. Need is documented in the needs assessment conducted by REACH. Student achievement in ELA and reading is low in grades 3-8. New, expanded services are integrated with other pipelines (p. e45) so that services are strengthened overall. For example: with the grant money they will expand early childhood and kindergarten readiness services as well as health and nutritional pipeline to overcome detriments to healthy habits at PS36 so that the above outcome in 1) is met.

**Weaknesses**

None apparent in this section of the application.

**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) As evidenced in the needs assessment, the target community experiences high levels of poverty (75% FRPL), minority populations, low rates of proficiency in ELA and mathematics, and chronic absenteeism (p.e18) and very underserved students who are ELLs, special needs, homeless, and new immigrants (p. e43, 76). The impact on the target community is likely to be substantial due to careful research and evidence supporting similar projects with demonstrated effectiveness as REACH (p.e72). They look to ESSA evidence criteria, other sites implementing FSCS grants, longitudinal studies, and other studies that document wraparound services for their constituents.

2)The organization is leveraging relationships with Teacher College and other partners to build an effective consortium intent on delivering the proposed services, as evidenced through the MOUs. Selection of additional partners in the healthcare, youth development and adult education services will be intentional seeking out those whose vision and mission align to that of REACH's and that will address the many needs of the Harlem Community (p. e71)

### **Weaknesses**

None apparent in this 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 has provided a MOU and a letter of support in the section Goals of the Partnership and agrees to provide services of their own expertise and leadership in the key areas as outlined by the goals and objectives of the proposal and to collaborate with all other partners to meet the needs of the community. In addition, Teacher's College agreed to provide matching funds if the grant is awarded in the amount of \$809,092.

2) Costs are well-documented and supported by independent studies and analysis to determine what the exact costs of the services should be and then this analysis was used to calculate what the proposed application will cost. Cost break down on p. e79 is detailed and specific, with an average cost of \$684 per person to serve 730 students and their families.

### **Weaknesses**

None observed in this application.

**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) There is a detailed plan for the management and consortium teams to meet and monitor the progress of the project's goals and objectives. These teams are essentially the project watchdogs who will make sure the project stays on scope and mission, and that regular monitoring of the

implementation and strategic goals will also help to adjust the program as needed (p. e82). Planning begins in January of 2020 (p. e85) and plans for each year will be determined in the previous summer to ensure vision of programming and services in place for the upcoming SY.

2) All project personnel are named, with the exception of the Community School Director. Each person has the amount of time commitment well-documented by percentage of total duties, where each subsequent year has a reduction of duties, with the exception of the 2 CSDs, who will be at 100%. There will also be a plan for the inclusion of staff development dates, and for focus group events to obtain feedback from parents and other stakeholders in the community, which will also help to achieve the objectives of the project as staff training is critical.

### **Weaknesses**

None observed in this 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**

1) The evaluation plan is thorough and uses multiple methods, which is designed to determine whether the project has been implemented with fidelity, whether it has met the proposed objectives, and whether it is on track to meeting the program goals overall. Research questions guide and maintain the focus of the evaluation. It will use a longitudinal data file of the participating students, and to determine the effects of the FSCS schools, it also will use a quasi-experimental comparison group design with a sample size overall (assuming exact match between treatment and control group) of 1,088 students.

2) The performance measures used will generate multiple streams of data, including qualitative data from observations (using a validated evaluation tool), focus groups, interviews, and questionnaires and quantitative data such as school readiness assessments, program attendance data, and academic proficiency data. These measures are closely tied to the outcomes of the project.

3) Evaluation plan uses an independent investigator. Regression analysis minimizes selection bias and ensures generalizability of the sample treatment population. Propensity score matching with replacements process matches participants with non-participants with similar characteristics.

### **Weaknesses**

None observed in this application.

**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**

4 organizations—Teachers College, Harlem Dowling Westside Center, New York Foundling, and Children’s Health Fund. Each organization brings a broad range of expertise and history of effectiveness in the Harlem Community.

### **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**

The four members of the REACH consortium (Teacher’s College, Harlem Dowling Westside Center, New York Foundling, and Children’s Health Fund) have partnered in a number of successful initiatives, including two previous federal Century Community Learning Grants from 2008-2017, two New York state funded Community School Grant Initiatives from 2013 to the present, two New York City renewal School grants from 2014-2019 and an Attendance Improvement and Dropout Prevention Grant from 2014 to the present. These initiatives have met and/or exceeded outcomes for student achievement as evidenced by the state summative exam in ELA (from 1-12% scoring proficient to 14-30% scoring proficient). Attendance rates, math and ELA scores have also increased in comparison with other CCLC schools. Shand et al. (2019) evaluated the impact of the REACH program in six Harlem schools validating the collective effectiveness of the partners.

**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 - 10

---

**Applicant Name** Teachers College, Columbia University      **PR/Award No** U215J190068

---

Questions

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

Priority Questions

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

Technical Review Form

**Applicant Name** Teachers College, Columbia University **PR/Award No** U215J190068

**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 provides evidence of a quality project design consisting of clearly stated goals, objectives and measurable outcomes such as proposing to increase student achievement through improved instruction by 10% each year. As support for services the applicant provided data indicating that students in grades 3-5 are not proficient in math (33)% and there is only a (29%) proficiency rate for students attending grades 6-8 on state mandated tests. The proposed goals and objectives of increasing student achievement levels by 5% each year is reasonable and aligned with the actions and outcomes indicated in the Theory of Action and Logic Model which is to strengthen instruction and curriculum through coherent professional development, increased number of students reading on grade level by second grade) (pgs-15-19).

2) The applicant presents data on the low proficiency levels on state mandated tests for students across grades 3-8 in English Language Arts (25%), and Math (19%) that support the need for the proposed project services. The applicant will provide pipeline services (i.e., high quality early childhood education programs, expand workshops pre-k for parents and teachers) that will address the birth to career continuum to include increasing the percentage of parent education courses available to the targeted population. The Early Childhood Education (ECE) component is well thought out and includes the appropriate readiness supports (i.e., educational and psychological services) to address early learning challenges (pgs. e44-45).

### **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 presents a comprehensive plan to work collaboratively with school administration and partners to identify the most significant needs, gaps in services, and programming. They have also identified existing high quality expansion services that will address the birth to adulthood continuum (i.e., expansion of pre-k workshops for parents and teachers to include subject matter areas as it relates to diverse learners, expansion of classroom libraries, and increasing the number of professional development workshops for teachers to support differentiation in services for special education students) (pgs. 16, 19-21).

2) The proposed project has identified partnerships that can support the overall project goal of the birth to career continuum as the partners have outlined their support and the types of activities they will provide in the MOUs. The type of support provided through partnerships range from the provisions for mental health, vision, and dental screenings that will be supported through additional licensed clinicians from partner agencies. Moreover, the applicant has identified strategies for addressing the academic and socio-emotional needs for three and four-year old children as they prepare to transition from Pre-K to Kindergarten to include training and development of teachers as it relates to high-quality learning experiences in the areas of literacy, math, and science, which aligns with the birth to career continuum (pgs. 23, 25, 28).

### **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 outlines the commitment of the partners to include attendance at meetings, monitoring program delivery, making recommendations, and providing resources (i.e. mental health and dental screenings) and programs. The signed MOUs highlight the expertise and commitment of each of the partners. Resources include meeting/classroom space, staffing, evaluation support and other project associated activities (pgs. 58-59).

2) The applicant is proposing to serve 730 students and their families, and approximately 60 teachers and school staff members at an average cost of \$684 per student per year. With the wide range of services to be provided and the anticipated benefits of improved quality programming and capacity building, the costs appear reasonable in relation to the number of individuals to be served (pg. 68-69).

### **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 timelines, roles and responsibilities are clearly stated and support the milestones presented. For example, in January 2020 the organization will begin planning for their expanded Summer Bridge program including a timeline for all tasks such as hiring and training staff who will work with the project (pg. 66). The applicant also provides month and year of the start of the evaluation plan associated with the project activities, milestones and outcomes beginning December 2019 with established timelines and objectives beginning November 2019.

2) Several job positions are identified Project Director, Principal Investigator etc. that are allocated to the project at a minimum of 49% in Year One. With the percentage of time gradually reduced over the five years of the project to 31%. The time commitment is logical for both positions since there will be two full-time Community School Directors (CSD), who will be responsible implementation and monitoring the project. The time commitments are appropriate based on the activities outlined and will result in meeting the stated objectives and outcomes for the project (pg. 64-65).

### **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 presents a formative and summative evaluation plan that focuses on a mixed-methods design guided by two questions (i.e., is the program implemented in ways that suggest it is on a path to achieve the stated goals? and is the program achieving the outcomes anticipated?). The proposed methods align with the goals of raising student achievement levels beginning with strategies at the early childhood level (pgs. 69-71).
- 2) Through the use of an independent evaluator trained in the evaluation of similar projects will be used to analyze the data collected. The collection and evaluation of qualitative data (i.e., observations of out-of-school time activities that measure the quality of the activities student and

parent focus groups, and attendance and enrollment data) will be used to random sample group of participants.0 Specific performance measures will be used to gauge progress towards the goals and objectives aligned with the project activities (pgs. 71-73).

3) The applicant's data collection methods align with the activities outlined in the Logic Model and Theory of Change, that focuses on conducting annual observations that will help in the assessment of the fidelity of the program model. The applicant identifies the various assessment tools that will be used to determine if the established measures (i.e., increase student achievement, grade level reading) will provide valid and reliable performance data (pg. 73-75).

### **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 demonstrates evidence of a broad range of stakeholders within the consortium who will support the proposed project design. The partners (i.e., Teachers College, Harlem Dowling Westside Center, Children's Health Fund, Smile Dental Program) include educational entities (elementary/secondary), child welfare agencies, entertainment, healthcare, non-profit, community-based organizations, and the business community. The overall project design will be supported by a variety of stakeholders with vast amount of experience to support the stated goals and objectives.

**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 documents a history of effectiveness to include partnerships with four of the primary entities that are part of the consortium. The partnerships are at least 5-10 years old and include partnerships on two federal 21st Century Community Learning Center grants, two New York State funded Community School Grant Initiatives, and two New York City Renewal School Grants. Improvements among the targeted population as a result of the collaborative work are described and include an increased ELA proficiency rate of 14%-30% and 50% higher attendance rate for students attending the program. The previous partnerships have mission activities that align with the proposed project design, which is another strength of the proposal.

**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** Teachers College, Columbia University **PR/Award No** U215J190068

---

Questions

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

Priority Questions

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 2**

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

**2. Competitive Preference Priority 3**

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

---

<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>
--------------	----------	----------

---

<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>102</b>
--------------------	------------	------------

---

Technical Review Form

**Applicant Name** Teachers College, Columbia University **PR/Award No** U215J190068

**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 provided clearly specified and measurable goals, objectives and performance outcomes. Key project goals are to: increase achievement through improved instruction and ELO; improve attendance in school-day and ELO programs; increase the number of students prepared to learn by increasing access to physical and mental healthcare; and increase parent engagement to support student achievement. The goals and associated objective were clearly aligned with the goals of the project. For example, the applicant will address academic issues in Goal 1: Increase student achievement through improved instruction and targeted expanded learning opportunities. The reasonable associated objectives and measurements are: (1) Objective 1: Increase by 10% each year the number of students prepared to enter kindergarten using the Health and Ready to Learn Index, measuring a) early learning skills, b) self-regulation, c) social and emotional development, and d) physical well-being and motor development, so that by year five 50% more students are prepared for kindergarten. (pgs. 23-25)

(2)The applicant effectively demonstrated that the proposed project design is appropriate to address the needs of the target population. The applicant indicated that the West Harlem targeted community experiences persistently high levels of poverty, upwards of 40% among its predominantly Black and Latino families and includes large numbers of children in temporary housing. The target schools are Title I eligible and serves 370 students in grades 6 through 12. Both schools continue to fall short of state testing benchmarks with less than 40% of 3rd – 8th graders achieving proficiency in ELA and math, and experience high rates of chronic absenteeism. Therefore, to address the identified needs of the targeted population, the program is proposing will target students, families, and school staff with integrated pipelines of supports that will improve student proficiency on state exams, attendance, and graduation rates. Pipeline strategies include professional development for teachers; coaching on the use of data to drive supports; tutoring and enrichment ELO programs; Summer Bridge transition programs; health screenings and health fairs; counseling and referrals; parent engagement workshops; and family celebrations. (pgs. 25-35)

### **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**

The applicant successfully demonstrated that the propose project will provide a pipeline of tiered services that is likely to impact the targeted participants and the community. The applicant indicated that the proposed project will target diverse students and families from a Harlem community and the program will serve approximately 730 students and their families, and approximately 60 teachers and school staff members at both schools.Thirty-three percent of the population is comprised of young people under the age of 24 years. (pgs. 33-35) The neighborhood struggles with several barriers and challenges, which has inspired the proposed project. Some of the challenges include: (1) persistently high levels of poverty and distress and 32% of Harlem’s children live in poverty, which climbs to 40% among Black and Latino children. (2) single parents head nearly 90% of households, and large numbers of children live in temporary housing-which includes homeless students, children in domestic violence shelters. An average of 75% of the targeted students will qualify for free or reduced-price lunch. (pgs. 49-55)

Based on the characteristics of the targeted participants, the project will likely impact the participants through: (1) the implementation of afterschool clubs in STEM, literacy, arts, service learning, and wellness that align to curricular standards and incorporate project-based assessments and reinforce classroom learning, (2) support partner schools with the design and implementation of tutoring programs that provide targeted supports for students that can be differentiated for students with special needs or ELLs, (3) Develop and implement a professional development program to build the capacity of Teachers College graduate students and community-based ELO staff to plan, deliver, and refine high-quality activities in partner schools. (pgs. 56-67)

(2)The applicant effectively demonstrated that the proposed project involves the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project services. For example, the applicant indicated that a consortium of community partners who have a history of working together to coordinate and deliver services will continue leveraging services in the community. The partner contributions will come in the form of in expertise in health, education, leadership, and psychology which provides the foundation for the program goals. (pgs. 56-57)

## 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 reasonably demonstrated the relevance and commitment of the proposed partners to ensure the successful implementation of the program. The applicant indicated it was key to select community-based partners with a strong commitment and have deep roots in the community as well as a proven track record of providing high quality services. The applicant provided a MOU in the Appendix that clearly outlines the partner roles and responsibilities. Teachers College will lead the project who will not only serve students directly, but also educational, psychological, behavioral, technological, and health initiatives. Other contributions will come from New York Foundling who provided a comprehensive spectrum of community support services designed for vulnerable children and families, such as evidence-based treatments in mental health. (pgs. 66-68)

(2) The applicant clearly demonstrated that the costs are reasonable in relation to the number of persons to be served and to the anticipated results and benefits for the participants. The proposed project will serve a total of 730 students and their families, and approximately 60 teachers and school staff members at both schools. students which is a per-student cost of \$684.00. The

applicant indicated the costs are reasonable given the level of coordination and the scope of pipeline services to be provided. (pgs.68-79)

### **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 reasonable plan for the management of the organization to achieve the objectives of the proposed project. The applicant indicated that a Management Team and a Consortium Team that will oversee all aspects of the implementation of the proposed services. The applicant indicated that upon funding the project will hire a fulltime Community School Director for PS 36 and other partner activities such as the MOUs and a workplan will be completed. Existing services will start September 2019 and planning will begin in January 2020 for the expanded Summer Bridge and will include a timeline and tasks to hire and train staff, coordinate student recruitment and identify curriculum throughout spring 2020. (pgs. 60-62)

(2)The applicant demonstrated that the proposed project will be led by a project director and relevant key staff to ensure implementation of the proposed project goals. The applicant indicated that for years 1 and 2 of the grant they have funding through New York City's Office of Community Schools to ensure a full-time Community School Director. The Full-Service Community Schools grant will allow the project to continue to employ a full-time CSD there for years 3- 5 of the grant periods. (pgs. 61-63)

## 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 application provided a detailed evaluation plan to ensure the goals and objectives of the project are met. An independent research and evaluation firm, Youth Studies, Inc. (YSI), will conduct a comprehensive, multi-methods evaluation. Both quantitative and qualitative measures will be used to assess whether targeted goals were met and the impact of program activities on the recipients. Formative and summative data will be collected. The proposed evaluation plan is linked to the goals identified and the associated activities in the narrative. All objectives will be measured, and data will be collected, compiled and analyzed throughout the project year.

(2) The applicant provided a clear plan for ensuring the evaluation plan is clearly aligned with the goals and objectives and the evaluation methods are appropriate for intended outcomes of the project. The applicant provided examples of the types of data to be collected such as student assessment data including: (a) academic proficiency in literacy and math, (b) on-time graduation, (c) annual observations of out-of-school time program activities during each year of the project, (d) student and parent focus groups, and (e) participant questionnaires. (pgs. 63-67)

(3) The applicant provided comprehensive evidence that the proposed evaluation has planned elements and components aligned with methods of evaluation that will provide valid and reliable performance data on the outcomes. For example, the project is planning to study the effects of attending the target schools using a quasi-experimental comparison group design. Based on 2017–2018 enrollment statistics, the treatment group will consist of approximately 544 students in grades 3–12. An equal-sized comparison group will be selected from the broad pool of Grades 3 through 12 students attending other New York City public schools. (pgs. 68-69)

### 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 proposed project has amassed a consortium of stakeholders who have been working together to coordinate and deliver comprehensive services for students and families in the targeted West Harlem community. The REACH project is a collaborative effort of multiple community-based organizations and stakeholders. The primary partners in this consortium include four organizations: Teachers College, Harlem Dowling Westside Center, New York Foundling, and Children’s Health Fund. Other collaborators include: The Achievement Initiative at Columbia University School of Social Work, Helen Keller International, SMILE Dental program, Follow Us to Success, Goddard Options Center, Manhattan Educational Opportunity Center at Borough of Manhattan, Community College, Double Discovery at Columbia University, and the Institute for Family Health. All will contribute to the pipeline of services across organizations to the overall effectiveness of the project. (pg. e42)

**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 have been working with consortium partners for many years to expand services in two schools in Harlem. A consortium of community partners has been working together to coordinate and deliver comprehensive services for students and families. The four primary entities working together in this consortium have partnered for a number of years in previous efforts including two federal 21st Century Community Learning Center grants from 2008–2017, two New York State funded Community School Grant Initiatives from 2013 through the present, two New York City Renewal School grants (2014–2019) and an Attendance Improvement and Dropout Prevention grant (2014–present) managed by United Way. (pgs. e45-48)

**Weaknesses**

No weaknesses noted.

**Question Status:Completed**

**Reviewer Score: 1**