

Technical Review Cover Sheet

Panel Details

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

Applicant Name Board of Regents, NSHE obo University of Nevada, Las Vegas **PR/Award No** U215J190009

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

Board of Regents, NSHE obo University of Nevada, Las Vegas

PR/Award No

U215J190009

Reviewer Name

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1.

The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers—

(1) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.

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

Strengths

Review of the goals, objectives, and the proposed activities as discussed by the applicant reflects that they have been purposefully aligned to the needs of the schools to ensure that implementation will have a positive impact on the needs of students, parents, families at these campuses. As well, the applicant shared that all 3 schools have the foundational infrastructure for implementation of private project activities focused on initial 3 pipeline services on their campus early childhood education classroom, a structure for after school programming/ summer learning opportunities, and parent and family engagement activities. Also, the applicant provided a Table of Top 5 Academic and Top 5 Well-being priority Areas as Determined by a needs Assessment that are aligned with the proposed intervention or program. (pp. e35-39) The goals are clearly articulated, specified and measurable based on review.

The Logic Model (p. e43) represents, quite clearly, the inputs, outputs and outcomes/impacts (long, intermediate, and long term) of the proposed project. A few of the long-term outcomes and impacts to be achieved include:

- Development of a community school model for the Las Vegas community for dissemination,
- Increased graduation rates
- Increased star ratings, and
- Better alignment of services across all sectors.

2) Over 850 participants provided information and input regarding the priority areas of needs and the project selected the top 5 and incorporated into the project design, the proposed project will adequately address the needs of the target population. (pp.e39-40) .

Weaknesses:

No weakness noted.

Weaknesses

No weakness noted.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Services

2.

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

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

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

Strengths

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

Based on the intentionally alignment of programs and interventions with the identified needs of students, parents, families, and community members the impact is likely to be quite significant. All projects activities are designed to enhance and expand the 3 existing pipeline services that are currently being offered. The applicant provided a logic model that states the likely outcomes and impact (short term, intermediate, and long term) of the project activities and interventions. Based on the meticulous design of the project, program activities, and interventions, the likely impact will be as stated in the logic model:

- increased academic achievement and closing of achievement gap,
- appropriate alignment of interventions and student and family needs,
- increase number of hours parents and families spin on school campuses,
- increase satisfaction with schools,
- increase number of students receiving integrated student support, and
- increased number of students focused on 21st century learning. (p. e43)

A value-added to the Quality of Services section is that the applicant provided descriptive information on each of the program activities and interventions to include who, what and when details. (pp. e30-71)

(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.

The MOU speaks to the total commitment, collaboration, and involvement of the consortium partners. Their roles, responsibilities, and contributive services are clearly outlined. For example, the University of Nevada, Las Vegas College of Education will serve as fiscal agent of the grant and oversee implementation of grant activities and funding to ensure a timely completion a propose grant activities. Also, in collaboration with CLV&CCSD, hire key project personnel and secure appropriate IRB approval to collect data, lead the data collection efforts related to programs and interventions proposed within the grant proposal. (p.e195)

Weaknesses

No weakness noted.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 25

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

3.

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

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

Strengths

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

There is a strong commitment to this application on behalf of the partners based on the letters and MOUs of commitment provided by the partnering organizations. The MOUs are very thorough and detail out the responsibilities of each partner. The MOUs align with the details included in both the Management Plan as well as the Budget plan. (pp. e172-193)

The application describes a demonstrated commitment of each partner by historical and planned funding by multiple partners 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.

Based on the number of persons to be served and the anticipated results and benefits, the cost seem reasonable. Based on the information provided by the applicant:

- Approximately 1700 students and 1100 parents, families, and community members will be served by the proposed project activities each year. By the end of the 5-year project period, 14,000 individuals will be served. The total costs are estimated at \$178.20 per participant.
- One goal of the project is that at least 60% of students and families are served. If so, the total number of individuals served in a 5-year period will be 8400. The cost per participant would be \$308.00. Therefore, a range of \$178-\$308 per participant across the 5 years of the project is estimated as an accurate cost range for programming. (p.e79)

Weaknesses

No weakness noted

Question Status: Completed

Reviewer Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

4.

The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors—

(1) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.

(2) The extent to which the time commitments of the project director and principal investigator and other key project personnel are appropriate and adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project.

Strengths

The applicant adequately addressed staff roles, responsibilities as well as their experience and expertise by providing a brief summary. For instance, the full-time project director will be hired between July and August 2019 must have a graduate degree in education with at least five years of expert practice or a doctoral degree in education. The director will have responsibilities that include managing day-to-day operations, supervision of the program specialists, data collection on each school campus and oversight of budget, etc. (pp. e93-96)

A comprehensive Table – Goals Management Plan outlined by project goals, the associated activities, artifacts to be generated and project timelines that provide assurance that project tasks will be met and accomplished as scheduled. As an example, the Project Director, RSLV Principals,

and Program Specialists are responsible Activity 1.1.3 Implement screening metrics three times per year. The artifacts generated from this activity include data from screening metrics for students on RSLV School campus. (pp. e81-96)

Based on the review of key personnel in the Management Plan section, and the review of resumes of the key personnel, the time commitment is appropriate and adequate to meet proposed project objectives.

The project evaluator (200 hours per year) has responsibilities for helping to identify assessment metrics, review nonprofit agency applications to provide services to the schools and ensure outcomes measures are observable, measurable as well as aligned to project activities. (pp. e94-97)

Weaknesses

No weakness noted

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

5.

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

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

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

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

Strengths

All aspects of evaluating the proposed project are well articulated and addressed with significant detail. As presented by the applicant, the proposed methods of evaluation are mentioned below. (pp.e96-110)

- The applicant presents a comprehensive implementation approach to evaluation of the proposed project – collect and analyze data using methods such as document review and content analysis, focus groups, acceptability surveys and student and participant outcomes.
- Methods also include qualitative, analysis of focus groups, interviews and artifact reviews, quantitative-quasi experimental looking at student growth, student achievement, demographic data.
- Use of mixed method approach intentionally integrate qualitative and quantitative Concurrent Transformative Design, formative and summative, artifacts will be collected.
- Human subjects’ approval will be sought by applicant.
- Applicant included the Project Evaluation Table that very clearly outlined both qualitative and quantitative performance measures for each project goal.
- The Evaluation plan includes an assessment of process, community partner and parent outcomes, assessment of student outcomes based on standardized or norm reference assessments. (pp.e96-110)

The applicant proposes to evaluate all aspects of the project with the intent to replicate the model throughout Nevada schools, municipalities and rural areas.

A descriptive Table that aligns with project goals and clearly relate to the intended outcomes and are designed to produced both qualitative and quantitative data is provided, Further it is inclusive of the collection of data through various means based on the performance measures as represented in the Project Evaluation Table column Metrics and Data Sources. (pp. e101-108)

Evaluation methods, processes, and thoroughness by the applicant speaks to proposed evaluations results that will be valid and reliable based on the applicant’s methods, processes, collections, analyses and assessment of the data as aligned to the proposed outcomes.

Weaknesses

Weaknesses:
No weaknesses noted

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 25

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority 2 - Broad Competitive Consortiums

1.

Competitive Preference Priority 2

Broad Competitive Consortiums

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

Strengths

The Board of Regents-University of Las Vegas consortium includes leadership from CCSD, the CLV, an UNLV; the principals and leadership teams of the 3 school sites; nonprofit organizations providing critical services to students on campus; and other critical government agencies focused on the well being of students and families in Las Vegas Valley community. Letters of support are included in the attachments.

Weaknesses

No weakness 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 applicant provides descriptive evidential data and examples that speak to the effectiveness of projects with collaborative consortium partners which started in 2016-2017. Examples include the expansion from 4 schools to 9 one year later. Two schools increased their rating on the Nevada School Performance framework – and three increased their overall index score, and 500 students were provided integrated student services through case management provided by a community coordinator. (pp.e23-24)

Weaknesses

No weakness 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 - 6

Applicant Name Board of Regents, NSHE obo University of Nevada, Las Vegas **PR/Award No** U215J190009

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
--------------------	------------	------------

Applicant Name

Board of Regents, NSHE obo University of Nevada, Las Vegas

PR/Award No

U215J190009

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 presented clear infrastructure goals that have binary measures of success (e31). Program goals, which are focused on improving student outcomes, are presented as specific and measurable (e32-e33). Examples of outcomes include percentage improvements in attendance, and proficiency levels on standardized measures of achievement (e32).

The applicant intends to target at risk/high need schools with resources and principals who are willing to collaborate (e33). The targeted schools already have the foundational infrastructure (e37-e38). Project activities will be tailored to the needs of RSLV-CSI schools (e37, e39-e41), and will therefore be appropriate to the needs of the target population.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses found.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Services

2.

The Secretary considers the quality of the services to be provided by the proposed project. In determining the quality of project services, the Secretary considers the quality and sufficiency of strategies for ensuring equal access and treatment for eligible project participants who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented

based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability. In addition, the Secretary considers the following—

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

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

Strengths

The services are designed to enhance existing pipeline services and focuses on short-term, intermediate, and long-term outcomes (e43). The project proposes that multi-tiered systems of support processes will be created by school principals and their teams (e44). There will be screening and referral processes so that the right students are funneled into programs (e45). The after-school (e55) and summer learning (e56) will include: intervention and enrichment programming (e55), community and civic engagement (e57), and social-emotional programming (e49, e58) and the intended impacts are increased academic achievement, connectedness to school and community, and social-emotional skills (e49). The applicant proposes to have evidence-based literacy interventions (e.g., Literacy Express, Voyager Passport, Reading Recovery) for all age groups (and Lectura proactiva/Intervenciones tempranas de la lectura for ESL students), the likely impact of this is improved literacy skills (e52-e54).

The integrated student supports (provided by non-profit and community agency partnerships and whole school student support programs) are intended to impact the alignment of services to support the needs of students, increase access to non-profit community resources, and improve academic, behavioral and social emotional outcomes (e60). The intended impacts of community engagement and mentoring include increased attendance in early childhood education, increased kindergarten readiness, increased academic achievement, setting college and career goals, and improved socio-emotional skills (e63). The intended impacts of parent and family engagement and advocacy are increased parent participation at school, improved parent understanding of their role in their child's education, and improved community outcomes based on parent programming (e68).

Services to be provided will involve collaboration of appropriate partners. School principals and their teams will collaborate to develop these multi-tiered systems of support (e44). Student Support Teams will be created to develop a student-based intervention plan and provide support. They will be made up of RSLV-CSI Program Specialists, the school counselor, learning strategists, teachers, Americorps and Safekey team members, and other stakeholders (e47). Other stakeholders will be chosen to participate based on their alignment with the goals and objectives of the project (e48).

Weaknesses

No weaknesses found.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 25

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources**3.**

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

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

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

Strengths

UNLV brings research acumen, the resources of a research university, previous experience running an inclusive preschool, and large urban elementary school; as well as a history of collaboration with the community (e73-e74). The city of Las Vegas has demonstrated commitment to providing high quality educational services to its citizens through such programs as early childhood education centers, and teen mentoring programs (e74-e75). The city also will provide matching dollars for some aspects of the project. Clark County School District has a history of innovative education programs and partnering with the community (e75-e76). The letters of support (e211-e222) and memorandum of understanding (e198-e210) also demonstrate commitment.

The applicant plans that the program will provide services to 1,700 students and 1,100 parents, families, and community members per year of the project. Using those estimates the nearly 2.5 million dollars will go towards providing services to 14,000 individuals, costing about \$178.20 per participant. The applicant also presents costs for the possibility that fewer people are served by the intervention, raising the per individual cost to \$308 (e78). These costs are reasonable for the services provided.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses found.

Question Status:Completed**Reviewer Score: 15**

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan**4.**

The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors—

(1) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.

(2) The extent to which the time commitments of the project director and principal investigator and other key project personnel are appropriate and adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project.

Strengths

The management plan clearly connects goals to specific activities, persons responsible, products that are generated from those activities, and the time period in which they will be completed for both infrastructure goals (e81-e83) and program goals (e83-e90).

The PI has committed to 0.25 FTE and the Project Director and Program Specialists are committed 100% FTE to the project (e93-e96), which is reasonable when combined with 50% FTE from Americorps Tutors and Safekey Employees, and 0.25 FTE from the Youth Development Specialist (e96).

Weaknesses

No weaknesses found

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

5.

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

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

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

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

Strengths

The applicant intends to use mixed-concurrent transformative design. The quantitative portion of the study will be a quasi-experimental design study using a matched sample from the same district (e99). Outcomes will look at student growth, achievement, student and family perceptions of climate and demographics. The qualitative portion will entail focus groups, interviews, and artifact review (e100). These methods are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals of the project.

The metrics are clearly tied to program goals and objectives (e100) and are measured objectively when possible using valid and reliable measures. Student performance is measured by a standardized kindergarten screener (BRIGANCE; e103), SBAC assessment (e104), MAP formative assessment, BASC-3 Behavioral and Emotional Screening System (BESS; e107); as well as by project/school participation and attendance data.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses found.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 25

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority 2 - Broad Competitive Consortiums

1.

Competitive Preference Priority 2

Broad Competitive Consortiums

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

Strengths

The consortium includes leadership from CCSD, CLV, UNLV; principals and leaders from school sites, non-profits, and government agencies (e22-e23).

Weaknesses

No weaknesses found.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 1

Competitive Preference Priority 3 - History Effectiveness

2.

Competitive Preference Priority 3

History Effectiveness

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

Strengths

The consortium has been around since the school year of 2016/2017 implementing community school activities that showed student growth in targeted areas (e23-e24, Appendix A [e117-e169]).

Weaknesses

No weaknesses found.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 1

Technical Review Cover Sheet

Panel Details

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

Applicant Name Board of Regents, NSHE obo University of Nevada, Las Vegas **PR/Award No** U215J190009

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**

Applicant Name

Board of Regents, NSHE obo University of Nevada, Las Vegas

PR/Award No

U215J190009

Reviewer Name

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1.

The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers—

(1) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.

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

Strengths

- The project clearly outlines the goals of the program to ensure the fidelity of implementation of the comprehensive interventions within the school through clear scaling supports and collaborative data sharing among sites (p.11)
- The project clearly outlines the development of infrastructure to support the collaborative mechanisms and the metrics to demonstrate success for each project component. For example the academic improvement goals include a clear timeline, with specificity of the metrics necessary with appropriate milestones.
- The program includes key personnel to ensure that the current interventions are getting to the target population, through coordination and intervention enhancement (p. 19)
- The needs assessment articulated in the project design included students and families of the target schools with high participation to ensure that the program design was inclusive of the community academic and well-being outcomes. The logic model on p. 24, further articulates a clear alignment between program inputs and the desires outcomes/impact of the intervention;

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 articulated MTSS systems (p.25) is specifically designed to ensure that there is equitable access to the intervention services provided. The on-site coordinator in conjunction with the school leadership teams provides a clear mechanism for accountability to maximize the effectiveness of project services. Further, the delivery of multi-lingual access points is designed to ensure equitable participation (p. 53).
- The afterschool and extended learning opportunities are clearly structured with a number of different outreach and attendance ensure processes (p.31) to ensure that identified students and families are actively engaged in the process.
- There is a clear collaboration framework set up in the project design to ensure that the school leaders are directly aligned with the chosen interventions for a specific school site. This method of coaching and capacity building presents a high degree of capacity building to ensure the efficacy of program services (p. 36).

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 different partners commitment is clearly articulated, and builds upon a historical relationship that suggests a high level of implementation and plausible success for the project. UNLV has significant amount of experience in this relationship with the schools and has demonstrated a commitment to the improvement of these schools through dedicated funding, staffing, and research.
- The quarterly review process for all stakeholders, with a relevant feedback cycle suggests a high likelihood of meeting the anticipated benefits for all partners (p. 57).

- The project clearly articulates a reasonable cost over the life of the program, with a projected scope of impact, with the ability for applicability of the model for other schools in Clark County.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

4.

The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors—

(1) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.

(2) The extent to which the time commitments of the project director and principal investigator and other key project personnel are appropriate and adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project.

Strengths

The management plan includes a number of activities that range from oversight to the timeline of completion of those activities. The clarity of responsibilities along with the deliverables/artifacts generated is clear and aligned with the intended impact. This particularly true for the artifacts generated for the Student Support Teams and MTSS processes (p. 26 – 30) at each campus and is clearly evidenced in the impact statement by the Clark County School District (Appendix A). The time of the Principal Investigator Dr. Morgan and Dr. Alain Bengochea, Co-Principal Investigator, is reasonable as a dedication of 25% of Dr. Morgan’s time(e93), and 12.5% of Dr. Bengochea’s time, with both investigators adding one month of summer work to the overall scope of work to manage and monitor the fidelity of the program.

- The milestones are clear, with clear project initialization dates, completion dates, success metrics, and accountability for the proposed scope of projects. For example, the kindergarten transition services (p. 65) includes the dosage, frequency, and connected outcomes with metrics aligned to overall project goals for academic readiness articulated in the project design.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

5.

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

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

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

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

Strengths

- The methods of evaluation are clear, research-based, and provide clear comparative analysis of what they hope to achieve. For example, the evaluation plan (p. 80) details the overarching evaluation design as a . mixed methods approach titled the Concurrent Transformative Design (p. 81), combining both qualitative and quantitative data sets. The qualitative data sets include interviews, focus groups, and artifact reviews using a case study model.

- Quantitative Data Sets include objective “student growth data, student achievement data, measures of student and family perception of climate, and demographic data such as the number of days absent and the number of students retained.” (p.80) With an appropriate IRB process noted (p.73) in the narrative.

- The evaluator is experienced in quasi-experimental design and is devoting a significant amount of time (>200 hours) on evaluation, with clearly identified objective indicators of evaluation, such as “RSLV-CSI Schools will be rated as Effective or Highly Effective on the Standards for Community School Initiatives Self-Assessment on 80% or more of the indicators for all 10 standards.” (p.82)

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 25

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority 2 - Broad Competitive Consortiums

1.

Competitive Preference Priority 2

Broad Competitive Consortiums

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

Strengths

- The applicants are representative of a number of different partners including two University Departments, the Clark County School District, and the City of Las Vegas.
- The principals and leadership teams of the three school sites have already focused on pre-planning meetings and ensuring all stakeholders at their school are ready for implementation plans aligned to the grant activities (p. 3 - 4) Further the stakeholders represent a board consortium composed of the University (to provide technical support, program evaluation) the local schools (to support implementation), and community service providers charged with direct service.

Weaknesses

N/A

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 1

Competitive Preference Priority 3 - History Effectiveness

2.

Competitive Preference Priority 3

History Effectiveness

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

Strengths

- The applicants draw on both the internal programming data (p.4) demonstrate a history of effectiveness evidenced by program expansion over the past 3 years, increased school performance on the Nevada School Performance framework, and increases in academic achievement on normed assessments for the target populations.
- Additionally, there is a large set of evidenced-based practices implemented in the schools aligned to the interventions proposed.

Weaknesses

N/A

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 1