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## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Des Moines Independent Community School District (U215J180055)  
**Reader #1:** **********

### Questions

#### Selection Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality of Project Design</th>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Points Scored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Project Design</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality of Project Services</th>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Points Scored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Project Services</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adequacy of Resources</th>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Points Scored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Adequacy of Resources</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality of the Management Plan</th>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Points Scored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Management Plan</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality of the Project Evaluation</th>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Points Scored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Project Evaluation</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sub Total** 100 99

### Priority Questions

#### Competitive Preference Priority 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rural District-Small and Rural or Rural/Low-Income</th>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Points Scored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Rural District</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sub Total** 2 0

#### Competitive Preference Priority 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Broadly Representative Consortiums</th>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Points Scored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Consortiums</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sub Total** 1 1

#### Competitive Preference Priority 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>History of Effectiveness</th>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Points Scored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Effectiveness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sub Total** 1 1

**Total** 104 101
Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - FSCS - 1: 84.215J

Reader #1: **********
Applicant: Des Moines Independent Community School District (U215J180055)

Questions

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 presented a well structured project design by presenting a thorough list of goals, objectives and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified. Pages, e25 - e29.

(2). The applicant provided a broad range of needs for the target population. For example: The Des Moines Public School educates over 34,000 students and have plans to expand the community school model from 14 sites to 18 sites. Page, e30. They created four foundational pillars to ensure high-quality conditions for teaching and learning for their students. The applicant provides a description of the demographics of the target population and also a description of the districts wide range of at-risk population. Pages, e30, e31, e32-e34. Tables, B,C,&D. Polk county has a profound effect on families’ ability to be food secure. The families also have limited access to physical and mental health services as well as the ability to access regular dental care and vision health care. DMP and the food Bank of Iowa currently partnered to provide school-based food pantries at 10 FSCS sites. Additionally, school coordinators will coordinate students in need of health care, vision, and screenings follow ups for care. Pages, e35-e37. DMP school also have a need to improvement students academic achievement proficiency in reading and math, the tables illustrates DMP’s students achievement data which shows nearly half of the middle and high school students, in most cases progressing at a lower rate than students in the entire district. Table, J & K. Pages,e43-e46.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader’s Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Services

1. 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 presented in detail the likely impact of the services being provided by the Des Moines Public Schools. Example: The applicant states that they have plans to expand and add four new sites to ensure a pipeline of effective services for students from pre-Kindergarten through post-secondary pathways, ultimately improving student and school outcomes. Another strength is to increase racial equity, a Black parent leadership council will be established to focus on services to support African American males. Pages e70.

The applicant also provided a table that shows how students are impacted by the four pillars of high-quality community school practices. Pages, e64, e68-e71.

(2). The applicant presented information describing the services to be provided by the proposed project from the partners to maximize the effectiveness of the project services. Example: The applicant states that Al Exito provides programs to middle and high school students, ArtForce Iowa improves the life and workforce skills of middle and high school aged at-risk youth, the Big Brothers Big Sisters of Central Iowa connect students with community based mentoring programs, the Evelyn K. Davis Center for Working Families connect Black male students at targeted sites with college and career focused mentoring opportunities and The United Way Education Funded Partners Serving FSCS sites is also outlined in Tables. Pages, e75,e85.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 25

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

1. 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). Clear examples of the commitment from partners to the proposed project have been presented for each partner. For example: The applicant states that Evelyn K. Davis Center for Working Families will contribute Job Coaches' time and services to middle school sites for up to 4 hours each month across 12 months, an in-kind contribution worth $10,800 per year of the grant. The Food Bank of Iowa will contribute $1,500 per site in food and basic necessity items each year, Grandview University will provide Professional Development to Community School Coordinators during year one of the grant, focused on the Family Leadership Institute curriculum (in-kind value of $6,000). Pages, e86 -e88. Letters of Support/M.O.U's are in the Appendix.

(2). The applicant presented project costs that are reasonable to implement a comprehensive, yet cost-effective model of Full-Service Community Schools at four new sites. Example: Total in-kind investment in the strategy will be $133,485 over a 5 year period, and cost per student is $124. (e91). Pages, e86-e91.
Weaknesses:
The applicant failed to provide additional information on the length and duration of OST services. The contractual cost for OST ($30k/year) doesn’t appear to be enough in order to provide adequate services for 2,158 students. (e90).

Reader’s Score: 14

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. 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 presented a specific and structured set of goals and charts to meet the objectives of the proposed project. For example: The applicant presented a detailed timeline that includes milestones and quarterly activities. The community school coordinator, the professional and partners responsible for activities have also been clearly identified. Pages, e92-e114.

(2). The applicant has documented the time commitments of the qualified project personnel that are adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project. Example: The first year includes activities that will engage families, beginning Year 1 Quarter 4 including the parent liaison program. The applicant also states that the CSC and site leadership team will be responsible for implementing and supporting the parent liaisons and that the CSC receives support from the site leadership team as well. Page, e99. The time allotted per paid position is reasonable and the stipend positions are paid by the hour. Pages, e92-e113,e114,e117.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.
Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. 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.

Strengths:

(1). The applicant has presented methods of evaluation that are thorough, feasible and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project. Example: Goal 1 and objectives will Expand integrated student supports to four identified sites to ensure each child is healthy, safe, supported, engaged, and challenged and goal 2 and objectives are to Increase community and family engagement at targeted sites. Pages, e92-e114.

(2). The applicant has included the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project. Example: The applicant states that using results-based accountability framework to help stakeholders identify factors and root causes contributing to disparate outcomes for youth (e118). Quantitative and qualitative data will be assessed as part of the project evaluation. Pages, e117-e130.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader’s Score: 25

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority 1 - Rural District-Small and Rural or Rural/Low-Income

1. COMPETITIVE PREFERENCE PRIORITY 1

   Rural District-Small and Rural or Rural and Low-Income:

   The Secretary gives priority to applicants that include a LEA that is currently eligible under the Small Rural School Achievement (SRSA) program or the Rural and Low-Income School (RLIS) program authorized under title V, part B (sections 5211 and 5221) of the ESEA.
Strengths:
The applicant did not apply for this priority.

Weaknesses:
None noted.

Reader’s Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority 2 - Broadly Representative Consortiums

1. COMPETITIVE PREFERENCE PRIORITY 2:

   Broadly Representative 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 presented a wide range of consortium partners in their district. Page, e58.

   Weaknesses:
   No weaknesses noted.

   Reader’s Score: 1

Competitive Preference Priority 3 - History of Effectiveness

1. COMPETITIVE PREFERENCE PRIORITY 3:

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

   Strengths:
   The applicant presented a history of effectiveness beginning with the inception of community school programming and has also built a strong foundation of community support which has been outlined in the five pillars of success. Page, e52.

   Weaknesses:
   No weaknesses noted.

   Reader’s Score: 1
Technical Review Coversheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant: Des Moines Independent Community School District (U215J180055)</th>
<th>Reader #2: **********</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Questions**

**Selection Criteria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality of Project Design</th>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Points Scored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Project Design</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality of Project Services</th>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Points Scored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Project Services</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adequacy of Resources</th>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Points Scored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Adequacy of Resources</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality of the Management Plan</th>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Points Scored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Management Plan</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality of the Project Evaluation</th>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Points Scored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Project Evaluation</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sub Total**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Points Scored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Priority Questions**

**Competitive Preference Priority 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rural District-Small and Rural or Rural/Low-Income</th>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Points Scored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Rural District</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sub Total**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Points Scored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Competitive Preference Priority 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Broadly Representative Consortiums</th>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Points Scored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Consortiums</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sub Total**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Points Scored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Competitive Preference Priority 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>History of Effectiveness</th>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Points Scored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Effectiveness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sub Total**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Points Scored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Points Scored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers—
   (1) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.
   (2) The extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs.

Strengths:

   The goals are clear and the objectives clearly connected to each goal (e27-9), the proposal also includes clear performance measures linked to community school services (e29-30). Racial equity goals of the district are incorporated in the proposal and reflected in the goals, objectives, and outcomes (e29-30). The community school pillars align with national best practices identified in the Learning Policy Institute's 2017 report, (e31).

   The target population is clearly described and the community school pipeline will serve 4,200 students (e22).

   The needs assessment clearly identifies gaps and disparities in Des Moines and Polk County, e35-56, and demonstrates alignment between needs and the goals and/or objectives in the proposal.

Weaknesses:

   None identified.

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Services

1. 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 proposal identifies services to be provided under each community school pillar and details on the evidence base for those services, (e70-72). Implementing outreach strategies that will increase equitable access to services, not just
providing new services, is part of the services plan, (e46). Additional opportunities/new programs are grounded in youth and community voice. For example to address the need for athletic offerings for sixth graders the CSC will work with the Activities Dept to survey students and develop offerings based on youth feedback, e70. In order to increase racial equity a Black parent leadership council will be established to focus on services to support male students of color (e70).

Collaborative leadership practices include the CSC developing relationships with neighborhood associations and business associations in addition to convening the representative leadership team, (e48). Collaborative partnerships are strong and at times include financial commitments from the partners, (e74). There are more than 15 existing partners, and 10 partners who will be included in the expansion or expanding services aligned with this proposal (e59-61).

Weaknesses:
None identified.

Reader's Score: 25

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

1. 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:
Project partners are clearly identified and are committed to the strategies. United Way is providing $500,000 to fund the existing community schools; Mosaic and Dental Connections, and Primary Health Care are providing on-site or referral health services. Family engagement activities are aligned with their partner, United Way’s, Income Strategy (e87), and is outlined in their letter of commitment (e145). The Center for Working Families is contributing $10,800/year in job coaches for the sites (e90); this service is included in the letter of commitment they provided (e146).

Total in-kind investment in the strategy will be $133,485 over 5 years, and cost/student is $124/youth (e91).

Weaknesses:
The contractual cost for OST ($30k/year) seems low, especially for providing services to 2,158. (e90). Additional information on the length/duration of OST services would be helpful in assessing the adequacy of this cost.

Reader's Score: 13

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. 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 timeline is detailed and includes milestones, quarterly activities. The person responsible for activities is clearly identified and includes partners and building administration in addition to the community school coordinator, (e92-114).

The first year timeline includes sequential activities that make sense—e.g. family engagement begins Year 1 Quarter 4 with the parent liaison program, after the CSC and site leadership team (both responsible for implementing and supporting the parent liaisons) are selected and operating, (e99).

Throughout all activities the CSC has support from the site leadership team.

Staffing descriptions include FTE descriptions, the time allotted per paid position is reasonable (e114 – 117); stipended positions include an hourly estimate.

Weaknesses:
None identified.

Reader’s Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. 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.

Strengths:
YPI is the evaluation partner for the initiative and is using results-based accountability framework to help stakeholders identify factors and root causes contributing to disparate outcomes for youth (e118). Quantitative and qualitative data will be assessed as part of the evaluation (e119).

There is a clear monitoring plan in place for continuous improvement (e121) that includes review and input from the school site leadership team, coordinators and other stakeholders. The evaluation should produce both qualitative and quantitative data related to the outcomes and performance measures of the project.

Weaknesses:
None identified.

Reader’s Score: 25
Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority 1 - Rural District-Small and Rural or Rural/Low-Income

1. COMPETITIVE PREFERENCE PRIORITY 1

Rural District-Small and Rural or Rural and Low-Income:

The Secretary gives priority to applicants that include a LEA that is currently eligible under the Small Rural School Achievement (SRSA) program or the Rural and Low-Income School (RLIS) program authorized under title V, part B (sections 5211 and 5221) of the ESEA.

Strengths:
Not identified as a priority area.

Weaknesses:
Not identified as a priority area.

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority 2 - Broadly Representative Consortiums

1. COMPETITIVE PREFERENCE PRIORITY 2:

Broadly Representative Consortiums:

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

Strengths:
The consortium includes community partners (United Way, Food Bank of IA, Center for Working Families), higher education institutions (Grandview University), health partners (Child Guidance Center), and the district, (e17). This represents a broad representation of stakeholders with expertise in fundraising, food access, supporting families, higher education, and health services as well as education.

Weaknesses:
None identified.

Reader's Score: 1

Competitive Preference Priority 3 - History of Effectiveness

1. COMPETITIVE PREFERENCE PRIORITY 3:

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

Strengths:
The proposal includes details on experience implementing community schools; 10,000 students are referred to vital supports in the community as a result of their current community school strategy (e58); the district has experience
delivering and partnering to deliver expanded learning opportunities, and 43% of students participate in OST activities (e59), there are 90 community partners providing services at schools in the district (e59).

Weaknesses:
None identified.

Reader's Score: 1

---
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