

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**      The Research Foundation for the State University of  
New York      **PR/Award No**      U215J190083

---

Questions

	<b>Points Possible</b>	<b>Points Scored</b>
<b>1. Selection Criteria</b>		
Project Design	15	14
Project Services	25	25
Resources	15	15
Management Plan	20	20
Project Evaluation	25	25
<hr/>		
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>99</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**      **101**

---

## Technical Review Form

**Applicant  
Name**

The Research Foundation for the State University of  
New York

**PR/Award  
No**

U215J190083

**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 application outlines 5 main goals. The goals of the project are clearly stated multiple times and each goal has multiple objectives and outcomes, and further identifies who in the project is responsible for.

2) Funding will be used to establish and scale up two FSCS sites. The goals of the project are aligned to the many problems cited in rural communities (p. 12). Great discussion as to what FSCS sites actually are and a brief presentation of their history was a nice feature of this application. Another important aspect of the design was in establishing the context for why rural FSCS sites have specific needs that urban schools do not have – transportation and a dearth of health care providers (p. 15).

### Weaknesses

1) There did not seem to be performance measures for each of their planned objectives in the project design (Table on pp. 24-32).

**Question Status:Completed**

**Reviewer Score: 14**

---

### Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Services

2.

**The Secretary considers the quality of the services to be provided by the proposed project. In determining the quality of project services, the Secretary considers the quality and sufficiency of strategies for ensuring equal access and treatment for eligible project**

**participants who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability. In addition, the Secretary considers the following—**

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

### **Strengths**

- 1) This is a very strong section of the application. Members of the leadership team will be selected to represent the target population of typically underrepresented groups. The logic model has a long-term outcome attached to it (p. 33). There are provisions for the regular monitoring of data to ensure that adjustments can be made as needed
- 2) All activities and strategies are analyzed for cultural and linguistic bias. Accessibility planning considerations are included in the project services and includes provisions for what will happen if a project component cannot be implemented. There is an extensive list of active partnerships, and these partnerships have also secured other streams of funding for this project, so that this grant is not the only supporting source for funding. For example, United Health Services has secured additional grant funding to Deposit and Whitney Point, two sites in the consortium (p. 42)

### **Weaknesses**

None apparent. This is an extremely detailed service plan.

### **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) Partners all have the capacity and experience to deliver on the proposed services and implementation plan. They also have a demonstrated success with other grant projects in the past. Consortium members support one another with services and resources, as well as secure long-term support for effective programs. If something is working well and is having an impact, they find ways to maintain the service, and seek ways to scale up.

2) The application is asking for 500,000 per year of the grant cycle, which seems reasonable, cost-effective and adequate. Sustainability is built into the 5-year grant cycle for non-grant years by recruiting new partners who will continue to carry out the services outlined in the application. Average cost for each person is <\$500 and \$450> per year (p. 63), which seems sufficient for the amount of services proposed.

## Weaknesses

None noted in this section of the 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. The management plan is directly aligned to project's Objectives and Outcomes (p. 65-75), and each management team member has clearly defined responsibilities and is accountable to project milestones. Another feature worth mentioning in the narrative is the Community Table project that will offer local residents shared leadership and decision-making professional learning opportunities, which will be paid by the grant funds (pp. 78-80).

2. Principal Investigator (p. 80-81) is committed to 10% in terms of duties for the project, and will lead all technical (preparation, conduct, administration). Project Director (p. 83) is scheduled at

.14 FTE and will manage the site coordinators and ensure implementation of pipeline services are meeting the needs of the target population. The time commitments of the lead managers of the project appear to be appropriate and will be able to meet the demands of the project.

### **Weaknesses**

None observed in this section of the application.

### **Question Status:Completed**

**Reviewer Score: 20**

---

### **Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation**

**5.**

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

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

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

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

### **Strengths**

1) The methods of evaluation in the evaluation section are thorough and feasible: 1) Whether 2 schools have been successful in implementing the FSCS and 2) if there are differences in the adoption of the model and if so, what were the factors that contributed to the difference? (p. 88)  
2. This section refers to outcomes “within the specific programs and services will be measured as they are implemented throughout the grant cycle.” (p. 94) For example, on p. 92, there are references to objective performance measures such as pre-and post-surveys, professional development observations, student performance and behavioral data, classroom observations, and site visits. Based on the wide range of performance measures, these have the potential to produce both quantitative and qualitative high-quality data.  
3) The applicant has shown in detail the process and methods of evaluation that have the potential to provide valid and reliable data.

### **Weaknesses**

None noted in this section of the 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**

There are 5 partners in this consortium of stakeholders. Each of the stakeholders has a detailed and clearly defined mission and focus and provides descriptive statistics/demographics for the population served. The stakeholders range from 3 districts (1 of which is a University Community District), 1 BOCES, 1 mental health service provider, and 1 civic engagement organization.

#### **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 consortium has demonstrated effectiveness in providing services to constituents in high need communities and documented 20 years of service in the community – they were instrumental in the development and implementation of the nation’s 1st Full-Service Community School. They have an established track record of funding from teacher education programs and the Commissioner of schools.

**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**      The Research Foundation for the State University of New York      **PR/Award No**      U215J190083

---

Questions

	<b>Points Possible</b>	<b>Points Scored</b>
<b>1. Selection Criteria</b>		
Project Design	15	14
Project Services	25	25
Resources	15	15
Management Plan	20	20

Project Evaluation

25

24

---

**TOTAL**

**100**

**98**

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**

**100**

---

Technical Review Form

**Applicant  
Name**

The Research Foundation for the State University of  
New York

**PR/Award  
No**

U215J190083

**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 identified goals and objectives for the project including developing and enhancing the school district capacities, improving early childhood education and family engagement, and strengthen and expand school-family-community partnerships. The identified goals and objectives are reasonable and appropriate for the proposed project given the needs



identified. As a result, the project will provide services to a largely rural area and looks to establish processes and supports that will continue way beyond the life of the grant such as Community Tables, Parent Cafes, family engagement nights, mental health services, counseling, academic support etc. (pg. 22-31).

2) The applicant provided the results of a comprehensive needs assessment to show how the services will directly address the problems. As documented, there are increasing poverty rates in the targeted area (Broome County) over the last two decades with a current high of 25% (up 9% from the previous 16% rate). Broome County encompasses a largely rural population and has the fifth highest poverty rate in the state. Further, needs assessment outlined the significant gender and age disparities in poverty rates and educational need. As a result, the applicant will align the proposed project with the Coalition for Community School's definition of a place-based school improvement strategy, which is evidenced in the overall design of the project. Some of the strategies to be implemented include: Integrated Student Supports, Collaborative Leadership and Practices, Enriched Learning Time and Opportunities, and Active Family and Community Engagement (pg. 5, 11-13, 32-33).

### Weaknesses

1) The applicant does not describe performance measures for the project objectives and outcomes described.

2) No weaknesses noted.

### Question Status: Completed

Reviewer Score: 14

---

### Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Services

2.

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

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

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

### Strengths

1) The applicant has identified a number of services that follow the birth to career continuum, that are clearly aligned with the Logic Model and Theory of Change framework outlined for the project. The evidenced-based activities, strategies, and interventions include family engagement, extended learning opportunities, after-school programs, home visits, and individual and group academic support. The applicant states that based on previous research and experience they anticipate that the family engagement services will result in improvements for the targeted community (pg. 32-40).

Moreover, the applicant understands how transportation challenges can be a barrier to success for the family engagement component because of the rural nature of the targeted area, the project services component includes contracting with local partners to ensure transportation resources are in place (pg. 36).

2) A wide range of partners have been identified to assist with addressing the various challenges facing the targeted community to include the Rural Health Network and Cornell Cooperative Extension who will focus on health and nutrition and helping families with limited financial resources to make healthy meals. In addition, the after-school academic support programs will be supported through volunteers from the local university, additional evidence of the community commitment to the proposed project (pg. 38-40).

### **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 provides sufficient evidence of the commitment by several of the partners to include providing support to the Principal Investigator through research assistants, assist in the planning, implementation, and facilitation of the project. There are sufficient letters of support outlining the commitment by each of the partners (pg. e118-129).

2) The applicant is proposing to serve 653 elementary students and 75 pre-k students, 218 family members, 50 community partners, and 50 parents for a total of 1,046 individuals at a \$478 per participant cost. 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. 62 -63).

### **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 provides a well-developed management plan that includes the critical activities of the project (i.e., establishment of a planning local Community Table for each school, expand school-family-community partnerships, increase community-based representation at each of the schools, increase parent leadership opportunities, and enhance social-emotional learning interventions). The management plan identifies appropriate responsible parties, timelines, milestones, and benchmarks for each of the identified tasks and activities (pg. 65-75).

2) The applicant identifies the various positions (Principal Investigator, Project Director, Project Coordinator). The identified individuals have the requisite background and expertise needed to lead the proposed project (p.80-83). Further, the applicant provides details on school administrators who will provide support to the project at 50% time, which should provide for the necessary support to achieve the stated objectives (pg. 84-85).

### **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 proposes a reasonable evaluation plan that will exam the processes, outcomes, and impact using two policy questions (i.e., have the two schools been successful in implementing full service community schools, and the forces and factors behind implementation) to determine if the proposed project design met the stated objectives (pg. 88-89).
- 2) The proposed evaluation design includes the collection of qualitative (i.e., pre and post surveys, interviews, focus groups, professional development observations) and quantitative (i.e., state mandated test scores, attendance) data that will be used to determine the overall success of the project (pg. 91-93).
- 3) The applicant will utilize the results form the evaluation to summarize key accomplishments and lessons learned at professional meetings and through the development of vignettes that will be shard through webinars, on the program website, and with the targeted community through

the creation of a final project report. The proposed methods have the potential to provide sufficient information on the strengths and challenges of the proposed project (pg. 94-95).

### **Weaknesses**

- 1) No weaknesses noted.
- 2) The evaluation plan does not include performance measures for any of the years of the project. Without this information it is unclear how outcomes for the project will be met.
- 3) No weaknesses noted.

**Question Status:Completed**

**Reviewer Score: 24**

---

### 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 has identified a broad range and representation of stakeholders that will continue to support the school districts in the surrounding communities. The identified partners consist of school districts, a mental health organization, and the Board of Education who have experience providing services to the targeted population (pg. 4).

### **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 provides sufficient evidence of a consortium with a history of effectiveness to include the success and years of working collaboratively with consortium partners. The Consortium has been working together for over 20 years and includes a wide range of successes (i.e., building of pipeline services in the local schools, identifying appropriate research and evidence-based practices to secure federal, state, and local funding to support pipeline services). Moreover, the applicant documents that they developed and implemented the first state and national countywide system of university assisted Full Service Community programs (pg. 5-7).

**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**

The Research Foundation for the State University of New York

**PR/Award No**

U215J190083

---

Questions

	<b>Points Possible</b>	<b>Points Scored</b>
<b>1. Selection Criteria</b>		
Project Design	15	14
Project Services	25	25
Resources	15	15
Management Plan	20	20
Project Evaluation	25	24
<hr/>		
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>98</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>100</b>
--------------------	------------	------------

---

Technical Review Form

**Applicant Name**

The Research Foundation for the State University of New York

**PR/Award No**

U215J190083

---

**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 described goals, objectives and outcomes for the overall project. For example, the project goals are: (1) develop UA-FSCS in two high-poverty, rural school districts; (2) implement evidence-based activities, strategies, and/or interventions; (3) enhance the learning support system within each school; (4) recruit and retain effective teachers and other professionals for practice in rural schools; and (5) disseminate key findings, lessons learned, and success stories to promote policy change, sustainability, scale-up, and replication. The expected outcomes are to increase the number and percentage of students who are: (1) ready to enter school; (2) attend school regularly; and (3) actively involved in their learning and community. (ps. 23-26)

(2) The applicant effectively demonstrated that the proposed project design is appropriate to meet the identified needs of the targeted population. The applicant indicated that one of the key functions of the consortium is to conduct assessments to determine need in the target area. For the FSCS, the consortium will provide services to 653 students enrolled in two schools. Additionally, family engagement and early childhood development services will be targeted to an additional 25 children in Deposit and 50 children in Whitney Point (a total of 728 children served). The multi-tiered pipeline of services is in response to efforts to target barriers and other challenges to learning such as intergenerational poverty, mental health needs, and addiction. Therefore, the consortium proposes to mobilize the resources of the support network to support schools, families, and communities. The plan also addresses teacher and social worker shortages in rural communities by implementing a grow your own teacher/social worker program at Binghamton University focused on rural schools. (pgs. 33-35)

### **Weaknesses**



(1) The applicant did not provide performance measures for each of the planned objectives. Without these measures, it will be difficult to determine project effectiveness at the end of the grant.

(2) No weaknesses noted.

**Question Status:Completed**

**Reviewer Score: 14**

---

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Services**

2.

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

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

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

**Strengths**

(1) The applicant clearly demonstrated that the proposed project services have the potential to impact the targeted population. The applicant will provide program services in high-poverty, rural school districts. The evidence-based pipeline activities, strategies, and/or interventions will be provided at each school. One of the major impacts is the inclusion the practices to recruit and retain effective teachers and other professionals for practice in rural schools. (pgs. 35-38) The intended recipient's will be have available to them onsite a pipeline of services including family engagement, extended learning opportunities/youth development, access to health, mental health, and social services, social-emotional learning, and early childhood development. In addition, the grant will expand professional development.

(2) The applicant successfully demonstrated that the proposed project will involve the collaboration of partners to maximize the effectiveness of project services. The applicant evidenced that the project partners have been working together for over 20 years providing a range of services for students, especially those in high-need communities. The applicant provided a detailed table that include information about the project partners and their detailed contribution. Key services partnerships include: Cornell Cooperative Extension, Crime Victims Assistance Center, the Mental Health Association of the Southern Tier, Family and Children's Society School Based Mental Health Clinics, and BC SAFE (Broome County Suicide Awareness for Families and Educators) Coalition.

## 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 successfully demonstrated that the proposed project will have the support and commitment of the partners to ensure a successful implementation. For example, to address a transportation barrier, the applicant indicated that on of the schools will allow after school programming and become a resources center. They will also support summer programs with transportation provided for 4-6 weeks to address summer learning loss and food insecurity for many families. (pgs. 45-50) The Consortium has had two programs noted for their work with schools: Keeping Youth Drug-Free and Safe (KYDS) Coalition and the SHARE Project. Both projects will continue to work with collaboration providing drug and alcohol education to schools.

(2) The applicant adequately demonstrated that the proposed project cost is reasonable based on the number of persons being served and the intensity of the project services. The applicant indicated that budget is \$500,000 per year for five years and adequate to support the proposed project activities. The applicant indicated that coupled with the commitment of the partners the project will offer a wide range of services to approximately 728 students, family members (approximately 218), school professionals (approximately 50), and community partners and members (approximately 50; including parents in the grow your own teacher/social worker

program) for a total of 1046 persons served per year. The average cost then for each participant is \$478.

### 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 detailed management plan that thoroughly describes their efforts to achieve the proposed goals of the project on-time and within budget. The applicant provided a chart with each objective. The objectives are aligned with a timeline for completion, the person(s) responsible. For example, the applicant indicated that the Principal Investigator & Lead Evaluator in years (1-5) will complete (Objective 1.D) in which they will monitor and evaluate programs, services, processes, and structures in support of data based decision-making and continuous improvement and learning. (pgs. 59-70)

The applicant successfully demonstrated that the project will have a principal investigator for the project (.10 FTE). The principal investigator will lead all technical aspects of the grant (preparation, conduct, administration), and assure that the sponsored project is in compliance with applicable laws, regulations, and institutional policy governing the conduct of sponsored contracts and research with direct oversight of the budget. She will be the point of contact for the project. A full-time project coordinator will be hired. The other key project personnel will include full-time Full Service Community School Coordinators at each school. The time commitments based on a review of the job descriptions are reasonable to ensure project implementation in a timely manner. (pgs. 68-70)

## Weaknesses

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

**Question Status: Completed**

**Reviewer Score: 20**

---

## Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

5.

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

- (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project.**
- (2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible.**
- (3) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes.**

## Strengths

- (1) The applicant provided a detailed evaluation plan that provided numerous multi-tiered methods of evaluation that are reasonable and appropriate for accessing the objective and the performance outcome measures projected in the project. The evaluation will be performed independently by an experienced evaluator, who will be looking to document how the initiative is impacting schools, students, families, and communities. (pgs. 80-88)
- (2) The applicant clearly aligned each of the objectives with evaluation methods that are aligned with the intended outcomes. The evaluation methods are combination of methods and procedures that will yield both qualitative and quantitative data. The applicant is looking to find out information about the partnership characteristics and capacities. Therefore, the evaluation data on partnership qualities will be tracked, including the number and types of partners governance and organizational structures, past training, qualifications, and experience of those involved (particularly those training others and those providing services), and the diversity of staff,

partners, and students and families served. (pgs. 80-86) Other methods employed will include pre- and post-surveying, interviews, focus groups, professional development observations, student performance and behavioral data, classroom observations, and site visits. For example, the project will use the Community and Youth Collaborative Institute (CAYCI) School Experience Survey to evaluate outcomes for students, families, and teachers.

(3) The applicant provided evidence that the methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes. The evaluation will use evaluation tools that measure variables such as academic motivation, college going and career aspirations, social skills, relationships with peers, and prosocial activities. (pgs. 90-100) Pre-surveying will be used to measure baseline community school knowledge with follow-up surveying to assess for any changes with intentions and applicability of professional development and technical assistance resources. Professional development surveys will be utilized to measure participant responses on the usefulness of UA FSCS resources and strategies, and for identifying resources needed in the field.

### **Weaknesses**

(1) No weaknesses noted.

(2) The applicant did not provide performance measures for each of the planned objectives. Without these measures, it will be difficult to determine project effectiveness at the end of the grant.

(3) No weaknesses noted.

**Question Status: Completed**

**Reviewer Score: 24**

---

### 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 will include a broad spectrum of consortium members. Those stakeholders committed to the project are: Binghamton University Community Schools; Deposit Central School District; Whitney Point Central School District; Broome-Tioga Board of Cooperative Education; Broome County Mental Health, and Binghamton University's Center for Civic Engagement. The applicant evidenced the partner relationship and contributions in the MOU and through letters of support. (pgs. 2-3)

### **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 consortium has a history of effectiveness working on various other projects. The applicant indicated that the members of the partnership have been working together for over 20 years building partnerships across school and community systems to provide a range of pipeline services for students, especially those in high-need communities. The consortium has used several methods of data and information gathering to effectively determine project needed to be developed. For example: (1) use of needs assessments to build a pipeline services in local schools; (2) use of research, evidence-based practices, and evaluation findings to secure federal, state, local, and foundation funding to support those pipeline services; and (3) the development and implementation of the state (and nation's) first county-wide system of UA-FSCS. (pgs. 3-4)

### **Weaknesses**

No weaknesses noted.

**Question Status: Completed**

**Reviewer Score: 1**