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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Points Possible</th>
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</tr>
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<tr>
<td>Selection Criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Project Design</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
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| Adult Education                       |                 | 0             |
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Reader #3: **********
Applicant: PEACE Foundation DBA Northside Achievement Zone (U215N110034)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Need for Project

1. Please respond to the sub-questions regarding the Need for Project.

Reader’s Score: 15

Sub Question

1. The magnitude or severity of the problems to be addressed by the proposed project as described by indicators of need and other relevant indicators identified in part by the needs assessment and segmentation analysis.

Strengths:
The applicant indicates some of the reasons the area was selected was based on crime statistics, TANF data, and lowered educational outcomes for students, particularly based on student race. (p. e24-27) Only 54% of target area students graduate. (p. e27) Schools are low-performing and not meeting AYP standards. (p. e28) Students need more preschool opportunities, students are mobile (25% of target students), and students have health issues such as asthma. (p. e30) Youth crime, including murder, affects the Zone. (p. e31)

Weaknesses:
None found

Reader’s Score: 10

2. The extent to which the geographically defined area has been described.

Strengths:
The applicant defined the boundaries of the area as a contiguous 13 by 18 block area of North Minneapolis with avenues to the north and south, an interstate highway on the east, and another avenue on the west. (p. e5) The entire area is served by the Minneapolis public schools. (p. e5) Demographics of the area are provided, including census data and lowered student achievement data. (p. e27)

Weaknesses:
None found

Reader’s Score: 5

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. Please respond to the sub-questions regarding the Quality of Project Design.
Sub Question

1. The extent to which the continuum of solutions is aligned with an ambitious, rigorous, and comprehensive strategy for improvement of schools in the neighborhood.

Strengths:
The applicant indicates that students in the area attend over 145 different schools and as many as 75% are below grade level. (p. e32) The applicant views solutions in terms of pillars of support, one of which is to engage and educate parents in the educational success of their children. (p. e33) The applicant indicates the parents respond better to persons who are similar to themselves, so that the project will use Connectors who are skilled mentors and coaches working one on one with families. (p. e34) This method has been piloted and would be scaled up during implementation. (p. e35) There will also be an academic case manager to work with parents, schools, and education partners. (p. e36) A family achievement plan will be developed for each family. (p. e38) Another pillar is to work with schools to integrate services, provide progress data, and develop extended learning opportunities. (p. e42) Principals are receiving training to be instructional leaders and coaches, and there is a focus on the importance of teacher effectiveness. (p. e45)

Weaknesses:
None found

Reader’s Score: 10

2. The extent to which the applicant describes an implementation plan to create a complete continuum of solutions, including early learning through grade 12, college- and career-readiness, and family and community supports, without time and resource gaps, that will prepare all children in the neighborhood to attain an excellent education and successfully transition to college and a career, and that will significantly increase the proportion of students in the neighborhood that are served by the complete continuum to reach scale over time.

Strengths:
The applicant has described a continuum of solutions that includes working in multiple respects with families both to support the education of their children and to gain parenting and other support skills; working with schools to improve principal and teacher effectiveness and to connect school with the family achievement plans; and extending learning opportunities during out of school time. (p. e49-51) Plans for scale up are provided, and most strategies have already been piloted, lessons learned and are ready for scale up. A clear model of the scale up strategies is provided in a graphic that also includes indicators of success. (p. e56)

Weaknesses:
None found

Reader’s Score: 5

3. The extent to which the applicant identifies existing neighborhood assets and programs supported by Federal, State, local, and private funds that will be used to implement a continuum of solutions.

Strengths:
The applicant indicates there are over 50 neighborhood programs and services connected to the project, of which 21 are lead organizations. (p. e57) The roles of each of these programs/services are indicated in Appendix F2. The applicant has already been working with these organizations during the pilot phase activities.
Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Services

1. Please respond to the sub-questions regarding the Quality of Project Services.

Reader’s Score: 14

Sub Question

1. The extent to which the applicant describes how the needs assessment and segmentation analysis, including identifying and describing indicators, were used to determine each solution within the continuum.

Strengths:
The applicant explained clearly how the initial needs assessment done during the planning year was used to develop pilot strategies that have been implemented prior to submitting the implementation grant application. (p. e3-39). Indicators were identified and described in terms of planned services/activities and improved outcomes based on those activities/services. Appendix F2 clearly outlined the segmentation analysis that supported each of the target strategies and intended populations, and the applicant provided a rationale for the decisions made on the basis of the segmentation analysis. The applicant provided a clear description of the process used during segmentation analysis. (p. e63)

Weaknesses:
None found

Reader’s Score: 5

2. The extent to which the applicant documents that proposed solutions are based on the best available evidence including, where available, strong or moderate evidence.

Strengths:
The applicant indicated both in the narrative (p. 3-45) and in Appendix F the evidence basis on which a particular approach, strategy, and/or service was identified. References to relevant studies and other literature in the field were provided both in the narrative text and in the Appendix. The applicant also indicated whether the research basis was strong or moderate, or whether the strategy or service was
Sub Question

based on emerging evidence.

Weaknesses:
None found

Reader’s Score: 5

3. The extent to which the applicant describes clear, annual goals for improvement on indicators.

Strengths:
Annual goals for improvement were provided in Appendix F. The goals were clear, and were expressed in terms of annual increases in the percentage of students, or percentage/number of families, or per other appropriate units of measure relevant to the particular pillar being described. These goals are part of the project’s scale up strategy based on the pilot implementation outcomes. The goals were clear for improvement within each of the pillars forming the overall project.

Weaknesses:
The applicant appears to have not included the referenced tables 1 and 2 that contain indicators and improvement goals. This omission results in an incomplete response to this criterion. It is not clear that the indicators used by the applicant in Appendix F correlate fully with the required indicators for the project.

Reader’s Score: 4

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. Please respond to the sub-questions regarding the Quality of the Management Plan.

Reader’s Score: 44

Sub Question

1. Experience, lessons learned, and proposal to build capacity of applicant’s management team and project director in working with the neighborhood and its residents; the schools described in paragraph (2)(b) of Absolute Priority 1; the LEA in which those schools are located; Federal, State, and local government leaders; and other service providers.

Strengths:
The applicant states it has a lengthy track record of grass roots and community driven work in the target area. (p. e69) The organization has refocused all its efforts to leading and providing infrastructure for this project. (p. e69) The collaborative has over 50 partners and includes both residents, local and state leaders, and school personnel. One of the lessons learned was that rental housing was controlled by landlords with questionable renting practices; this issue is being brought to the attention of the city. The project director is a long-time local resident in the community, a factor which will improve communication with the neighborhood residents.

Weaknesses:
None found

Reader’s Score: 10
2. Experience, lessons learned, and proposal to build capacity of applicant’s management team and project director in collecting, analyzing, and using data for decision-making, learning, continuous improvement, and accountability, including whether the applicant has a plan to build, adapt, or expand a longitudinal data system that integrates student-level data from multiple sources in order to measure progress while abiding by privacy laws and requirements.

Strengths:
The applicant has used, and will continue to rely on, neighborhood annual surveys to assess change, program implementation data, and links to school, local and state data sets. (p. e76-77) The applicant stated that a longitudinal data system for student data is already in place and will be expanded for the project. (p. e81) The applicant plans to work with the management team to improve capacity for using data and for making decisions for continuous improvement. (p. e83) A lesson learned was that its partnership with Wilder Research was capable of carrying out a rigorous, scientifically valid survey. (p. e78)

Weaknesses:
None found

Reader’s Score: 15

3. Experience, lessons learned, and proposal to build capacity of applicant’s management team and project director in creating formal and informal partnerships, including the alignment of the visions, theories of action, and theories of change described in its memorandum of understanding, and creating a system for holding partners accountable for performance in accordance with the memorandum of understanding.

Strengths:
The applicant has articulated a clear set of goals and principles for the project (p. e3) which are stated to be shared by the partners. The applicant already has built a collaborative of over 50 entities. Long term strategizing will also be a part of management team activities. (p. e84)

Weaknesses:
It is not clear that the applicant has described each of the partners’ visions, theories of action, and theories of change. The MOUs do not address this area.

Reader’s Score: 9

4. Experience, lessons learned, and proposal to build capacity of applicant’s management team and project director in integrating funding streams from multiple public and private sources, including its proposal to leverage and integrate high-quality programs in the neighborhood into the continuum of solutions.

Strengths:
The applicant has over a million dollar revenue stream committed to the project. (p. e84) The amount to be contributed by each project partner is clearly explained, and is included in the MOU agreements provided in the appendix. The sources of funding include private foundation funding as well as individuals and corporate investors. (p. e85) The applicant learned that it would need to serve as a vehicle for realigning existing government and foundation sources to achieve the long term revenue goal. (p. e84)

Weaknesses:
None found

Reader’s Score: 10
Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - CPP4 Early Learning

1. To meet this priority, an applicant must propose in its plan to expand, enhance, or modify, an existing network of early learning programs and services to ensure they are high-quality and comprehensive for children from birth through the third grade.

Strengths:
The applicant intends to expand an existing early learning network and has been working for the past two years on this part of the project. (p. e46) The applicant will partner with Resources for Child Caring to identify parent awareness of the availability of slots for young project children, and will continue the early childhood scholarship program currently being implemented as a pilot in the state. (p. e48)

Weaknesses:
None found

Reader’s Score: 2

Competitive Preference Priority - CPP5 Internet Access

1. To meet this priority, an applicant must ensure that almost all students in the geographic area proposed to be served have broadband Internet access at home and at school, the knowledge and skills to use broadband internet access effectively, and a connected computing device to support schoolwork.

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader’s Score:

Competitive Preference Priority - CPP6 Arts and Humanities

1. To meet this priority, an applicant must include in its plan opportunities for children and youth to experience and participate actively in the arts and humanities in their community so as to broaden, enrich, and enliven the educational, cultural, and civic experiences available in the neighborhood.

Strengths:
The applicant has four arts and culture partners, including the Capri Theater, Juxtaposition Arts, Lundstrum Center, and the MN Children's Museum at the public library. These providers offer out of school opportunities for youth enrolled in the project. The project intends to provide a higher profile for these opportunities and better connect adults and children to the arts through these providers. (p. e52)

Weaknesses:
None found

Reader’s Score: 1
Competitive Preference Priority - CPP7 Affordable Housing

1. To meet this priority, an applicant must propose to serve geographic areas that were the subject of an affordable housing transformation pursuant to a Choice Neighborhoods or HOPE VI grant awarded by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development during FY2009 or later years.

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

Invitational Priority - Adult Education

1. To meet this priority, an applicant must include a plan that is coordinated with adult education providers serving neighborhood residents, such as those funded through the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act, as amended. Coordinated services may include adult basic and secondary education and programs that provide training and opportunities for family members and other members of the community to support student learning and establish high expectations for student educational achievement. Examples of services and programs include preparation for the General Education Development (GED) test; English literacy, family literacy, and work-based literacy training; or other training that prepares adults for postsecondary education and careers, or supports adult engagement in the educational success of children and youth in the neighborhood.

No

Reader's Score:
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Last Updated: 11/15/2011 12:37 PM
### Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** PEACE Foundation DBA Northside Achievement Zone (U215N110034)

**Reader #2:** **********

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Points Scored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Selection Criteria</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Need for Project</strong></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Need for Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality of Project Design</strong></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Quality of Project Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality of Project Services</strong></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Qual. of Project Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality of the Management Plan</strong></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Qual. of Management Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Priority Questions

**Competitive Preference Priority**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competitive Preference Priority</th>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Points Scored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CPP4 Early Learning</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. CPP4 Early Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CPP5 Internet Access</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. CPP5 Internet Access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CPP6 Arts and Humanities</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. CPP6 Arts and Humanities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CPP7 Affordable Housing</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. CPP7 Affordable Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Invitational Priority**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Invitational Priority</th>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Points Scored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adult Education</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Adult Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total

| Total                                          | 105             | 96            |
|                                                |                 |               |
Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - Tier II Panel - 1: 84.215N

Reader #2: **********
Applicant: PEACE Foundation DBA Northside Achievement Zone (U215N110034)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Need for Project

1. Please respond to the sub-questions regarding the Need for Project.

Reader’s Score: 14

Sub Question

1. The magnitude or severity of the problems to be addressed by the proposed project as described by indicators of need and other relevant indicators identified in part by the needs assessment and segmentation analysis.

Strengths:
The need indicators cover academic, economic, health and family-community issues that are documented. The target PN area was selected as it has the highest concentration of negative indicators in the city. There are 14,800 residents, 38% are children. 50% of the residents are African-American, with other minorities comprising another 25%. 61% of the African-American residents are living in poverty, compared to 8% in the rest of the city. The unemployment rate is 3 times higher for NAZ residents than for their white counterparts. There is a 25% homeless rate. Those who do own homes experience 33% foreclosures in NAZ compared to 8% in the rest of the city. The academic achievement data for grades 3-12 are significantly lower for all NAZ students with even greater disparities between minorities and whites, which ranks among the highest in the US. The children who live in NAZ attend 145 different schools making communication and continuity of education difficult. The Kindergarten readiness rate for NAZ youngsters is about 25% compared to 71% in the rest of the city. There are lower numbers of students participating in mentoring and out-of-school activities in NAZ as compared to the rest of the city. There are higher than state and national numbers of teen pregnancy and infant mortality rates.

Weaknesses:
There are no weaknesses noted.

Reader’s Score: 10

2. The extent to which the geographically defined area has been described.

Strengths:
The NAZ targeted PN area is located in an urban setting, within the city limits of Minneapolis MN. It is a 13X18 block enclave that was designated as the NAZ due to the presence of a significantly high number of need indicators for a relatively small population of 14,000. Housing consists of public housing and privately owned apartment buildings with some private homes, many of which have been foreclosed or are in danger of foreclosure. The area has several major streets and highways.
Sub Question

that surround and cross through it. There are 9 targeted schools in NAZ.

Weaknesses:
The applicant has not thoroughly described the geography and physical layout of the NAZ. The location of the targeted schools, as well other schools inside the PN area is not provided. The location of public housing that is discussed in the narrative response, as well as the location of the NAZ sites, should be included.

Reader’s Score: 4

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. Please respond to the sub-questions regarding the Quality of Project Design.

Reader’s Score: 24

Sub Question

1. The extent to which the continuum of solutions is aligned with an ambitious, rigorous, and comprehensive strategy for improvement of schools in the neighborhood.

Strengths:
The applicant has designed a continuum of solutions based on a comprehensive strategy that undergirds their project’s implementation. Having not only conducted a planning project for the implementation of this project, but also piloted many of the key solutions the applicant is one step ahead before the PN project is implemented. As a result these solutions, as well as some that were not piloted, are ready to begin expansion into more classrooms, families and schools. Each of the solutions selected support one or more of the three pillars that informs their strategy. The solutions have been selected as they intend to engage parents and families, support and enhance the schools and increase access and participation of NAZ residents to available support services. The intent to remove barriers to learning and growth is central. Most of the solutions have been piloted in a small number of NAZ schools and all have been researched and assessed by professional staff and NAZ representatives. In Appendix F key information about each solution is described, including: alignment to the need indicators, the number and type of target audience, the evidence that was reviewed, staffing, the cost per participant and the scale up numbers. Family solutions include the creation of Academic Navigators, residents who are trained and will serve as mentors and coaches for students and families emphasizing the support of learning and academic proficiency. Professional development for the principals is noted.

Weaknesses:
There were no weaknesses noted.

Reader’s Score: 10

2. The extent to which the applicant describes an implementation plan to create a complete continuum of solutions, including early learning through grade 12, college- and career-readiness, and family and community supports, without time and resource gaps, that will prepare all children in the neighborhood to attain an excellent education and successfully transition to college and a career, and that will significantly increase the proportion of students in the neighborhood that are served by the complete continuum to reach scale over time.
Sub Question

Strengths:
In Appendix F.2 the applicant presents a comprehensive summary of the list of solutions and aligns each with key information, the need indicator and basis for identifying each. Also referenced for each is the scale up numbers, the provider of the service and the funding source. The solutions selected by the applicant cover the complete continuum from pre-school to college and career. The scaling up of the project solutions is intended, over time, to follow students through their K-12 schooling and to prepare them for college with a career path. School transitions and continuity of learning is addressed. There is a visual model of the Scale-up process along with narrative description. Pages 35-36. Time and resource gaps are diminished due to the piloting of key solutions. Family supports are addressed across the continuum. Phased in, targeted professional development for teachers and administrators is on-going. Pages 20-23. There are classroom, coaching and online components. The Early Learning Network includes parent education and support, financial partnerships and incentives, screenings, professional development. Page 28. Academic Navigators will work with families and students. Health and wellness initiatives are integrated across the curriculum. Solutions are based on the need indicators and share a common theory of change.

Weaknesses:
The solutions and integration of the college to career focus is not well developed. There is little emphasis on the post-high school, college component which is only planned for the Middle School.

Reader's Score: 4

3. The extent to which the applicant identifies existing neighborhood assets and programs supported by Federal, State, local, and private funds that will be used to implement a continuum of solutions.

Strengths:
There are 21 lead organizations, identified as Anchor Partners, representing an array of service providers and support agencies. These partners have all signed the MOU and have committed resources, services and funding. In Appendix F the list of services and programs from each of the partners is listed and described, the amount of their funding match and the number of NAZ families and children that they are currently serving is provided.

Weaknesses:
There are no weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

4. The extent to which the applicant describes its implementation plan, including clear annual goals for improving systems and leveraging resources as described in paragraph (2) of Absolute Priority 1.

Strengths:
The letters in the appendix from funders represent a $630K match, over the 10% required match for the PN project. The applicant describes the on-going efforts to create additional funding for the project, as a step to post-grant sustainability. Page 37. There are plans to collaborate with the city and state in shifting program support to additional outside funding, while consistently supporting the NAZ mission and goals. The applicant believes that the experience and success of undertaking this comprehensive project will prove to be a validation for the applicant and partners in terms of their ability to garner funding post-grant. Examples of improving systems include including new partnerships in the project, and influencing policy changes that reconfigure staffing. Pages 33-38.

Weaknesses:
There are no weakness noted.
Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Services

1. Please respond to the sub-questions regarding the Quality of Project Services.

Sub Question

Reader's Score: 5

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Services

1. Please respond to the sub-questions regarding the Quality of Project Services.

Sub Question

Reader's Score: 12

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Services

1. The extent to which the applicant describes how the needs assessment and segmentation analysis, including identifying and describing indicators, were used to determine each solution within the continuum.

Strengths:
The NAZ and Wilder research developed and completed a survey that was administered in 2010. The data collection was guided by a reliance on evidenced-based procedures and design, and an environment that supported transparency in design, collection, analysis and interpretation. There were multiple stakeholders involved in the process. The survey covered an array of topics, including: demographics, community climate of support for children's well-being and education, access to, need for services, current educational situations of children and their parents perceptions of them. Page 6. The Needs Assessment included the data from this survey in addition to data from public sources such as schools, state and city data, employment and income data and data and input from community assessments. In all, four years of relevant data was collected, reviewed, analyzed and interpreted. Quantitative and qualitative data was reviewed. The Segmentation Analysis broke down the data by age, gender, and other indicators. The assessment and subsequent segmentation analysis revealed some results which were not unexpected and some that were. For example, there were a high number of NAZ residents who had low educational attainment and wanted to do something about it; at the same time there were a high number of NAZ respondents who were unaware of or had not accessed the educational services within the community that could assist them. Each need indicator that was identified through the assessment and segmentation analysis went through a vetting process for solutions. Each suggested or identified solution was researched and reviewed. Those that met the needs of the project were further examined until the NAZ team selected the solutions that best addressed the continuum of needs. Pages 10-14. Appendix F2.

Weaknesses:
There are no weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Services

2. The extent to which the applicant documents that proposed solutions are based on the best available evidence including, where available, strong or moderate evidence.

Strengths:
In Appendix F.1 the applicant presents a comprehensive and detailed summary of the evidence that was reviewed in the process of selecting solutions for the project to implement. They have aligned the proposed solutions with the relevant research. The applicant provides a comprehensive description of the multi-level process of selecting solutions.

Weaknesses:
The parent education curriculum is being developed by the project staff; it has four phases beginning with the section for parents of pre-school children, which is the only phase of the curriculum that is completed. The efficacy of a curriculum created in-house and that is only 25% complete as the PN begins, is questionable. There are a list of parent education curriculums recommended by the state and
Sub Question

Federal DOE that have undergone rigorous implementation assessments for efficacy and can be integrated into the project. Collecting data on a program that has no basis for impact and efficacy will be difficult.

Reader’s Score: 4

3. The extent to which the applicant describes clear, annual goals for improvement on indicators.

Strengths:
There are annual goals for the solutions of the project. The numbers and/or percentages of change is provided. They are directed linked back to the need indicator that they are addressing.

Weaknesses:
The applicant has left out some critical information in their response to this criterion. The description of annual goals for each of the required Promise Neighborhood indicators of need has not been included. On page 35 there are benchmarks provided for three of the ten required indicators. Annual goals that are measurable, clearly written, and reasonable for the activity or program that they relate to is a necessary part of this or any comprehensive project.

Reader’s Score: 3

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. Please respond to the sub-questions regarding the Quality of the Management Plan.

Reader’s Score: 43

Sub Question

1. Experience, lessons learned, and proposal to build capacity of applicant’s management team and project director in working with the neighborhood and its residents; the schools described in paragraph (2)(b) of Absolute Priority 1; the LEA in which those schools are located; Federal, State, and local government leaders; and other service providers.

Strengths:
The applicant describes their history in the community and the experience that they bring to the project. They have a history of successful partnerships with local, state organizations and in helping to create policy changes. The applicant is recognized in the community for its ability to successfully partner with multiple organizations while adhering to a common strategy and goal. The management team, project director and CEO all have significant experience in working with large community projects, with schools and families. The applicant describes how they will build the capacity by building the infrastructure. Pages 48, 59. There are resumes and CVs of key staff members. The applicant describes past project from which they have gained knowledge and skills that they bring to the PN project.

Weaknesses:
There are no weaknesses noted.

Reader’s Score: 10

2. Experience, lessons learned, and proposal to build capacity of applicant’s management team and project director in collecting, analyzing, and using data for decision-making, learning, continuous improvement, and accountability, including whether the applicant has a plan to build, adapt, or
expand a longitudinal data system that integrates student-level data from multiple sources in order to measure progress while abiding by privacy laws and requirements.

Strengths:
The applicant has provided a comprehensive overview of the development of project-specific surveys, collection, review, analysis and interpretation of project-related data. They have demonstrated how they have learned from their experience and how that informs their projects going forward. The proposed project is described as being data-driven in its accountability, using data for continuous improvement and on-going oversight. Part of the accountability is adhering to required privacy and confidentiality laws. The applicant describes how the data is used to provide on-going real-time information that is used to drive continuous improvement in the project. The applicant conducts an annual survey of households in the community which provides a portion of the data that is used to create a longitudinal database. In addition to the survey, internal evaluation data is collected twice a year to assess the implementation and management of the project. The third source of data is from public sources gathering student educational attainment and social outcomes for the population. Public data includes graduation rates, achievement testing scores, attendance and behavioral records from schools, adult employment and income data, public assistance and TANF numbers, and post secondary school enrollment and graduation numbers.

Weaknesses:
There are no weaknesses noted.

Reader’s Score: 15

3. Experience, lessons learned, and proposal to build capacity of applicant’s management team and project director in creating formal and informal partnerships, including the alignment of the visions, theories of action, and theories of change described in its memorandum of understanding, and creating a system for holding partners accountable for performance in accordance with the memorandum of understanding.

Strengths:
The MOUs cite the agreement to commit to the theory of change as developed for this project. All partnering organizations agree to the collection of data for each of the solutions proposed, and to be an active partner giving high priority to the project. The applicant cites their history of grassroots initiatives such as the PN. They have a demonstrated history of gathering together a management team and key personnel for a project that is suited to their responsibilities on the project and have resultant successful outcomes. Page 62-63.

Weaknesses:
The applicant does not describe how the 21 partners in the project will be held accountable throughout the project’s implementation. The signed MOUs are state that the document is a non-binding expression of intent to collaborate. More information is needed to verify the commitment of the partners and the way that they will be held accountable to insure that the project is implemented as designed. (MOUs). The partners who signed the MOUs have not included their organization’s theories of change and action and visions. They are required as project partners to not only agree to support the theories and vision of the lead agency, but to describe their theories and visions in terms of working in the project with no conflicts in these areas.

Reader’s Score: 8

4. Experience, lessons learned, and proposal to build capacity of applicant’s management team and project director in integrating funding streams from multiple public and private sources, including its proposal to leverage and integrate high-quality programs in the neighborhood into the continuum of solutions.
Sub Question

Strengths:
The applicant has included a listing of the funding commitments from multiple sources for this project. Each of the 21 partners has committed specific amounts of funding and other resources to the project. There is an attachment Appendix F.5 that lists the partners, whether they bring direct services or capacity building services, whether they are an Anchor Partner, and the role, match, amount of the match and the number of individuals to be served, either directly or indirectly. The sources are private, non-profits, public and government entities. The narrative supports the information in the Appendix. The organization and administration of the fiscal management for the project is well thought out and developed.

Weaknesses:
There are no weaknesses noted.

Reader’s Score: 10

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - CPP4 Early Learning

1. To meet this priority, an applicant must propose in its plan to expand, enhance, or modify, an existing network of early learning programs and services to ensure they are high-quality and comprehensive for children from birth through the third grade.

Strengths:
The Early Learning Network proposed is to be managed by the NAZ Early childhood Action Team. The Team has been working for two years building a network of coordinated services for pre-school children and their families to ensure Kindergarten readiness. Page 25. The programming and services are part of the evidenced-based solution addressing the indicators of need for young children in the PN community. The key components include expanding the number of slots available so all children can have access to early learning education and supports. There is a strong parent component and there is a comprehensive list of services and programs that will be available. The plan calls for a scaling up from the initial 108 children under the age of 5 to 550 children by the end of the second year.

Weaknesses:
There are no weaknesses noted.

Reader’s Score: 2

Competitive Preference Priority - CPP5 Internet Access

1. To meet this priority, an applicant must ensure that almost all students in the geographic area proposed to be served have broadband Internet access at home and at school, the knowledge and skills to use broadband internet access effectively, and a connected computing device to support schoolwork.

Strengths:
The applicant did not respond to this Priority.

Weaknesses:
The applicant did not respond to this Priority.
Competitive Preference Priority - CPP6 Arts and Humanities

1. To meet this priority, an applicant must include in its plan opportunities for children and youth to experience and participate actively in the arts and humanities in their community so as to broaden, enrich, and enliven the educational, cultural, and civic experiences available in the neighborhood.

**Strengths:**
The proposed program integrates four arts and cultural institutions in the city who have joined together to reaching out to the children in the NAZ community to enroll them into the NAZ Connect tool. These providers offer out-of-school opportunities for NAZ community youth who are enrolled.

**Weaknesses:**
There are no weaknesses noted.

Reader’s Score: 1

Competitive Preference Priority - CPP7 Affordable Housing

1. To meet this priority, an applicant must propose to serve geographic areas that were the subject of an affordable housing transformation pursuant to a Choice Neighborhoods or HOPE VI grant awarded by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development during FY2009 or later years.

**Strengths:**
The applicant did not respond to this Priority.

**Weaknesses:**
The applicant did not respond to this Priority.

Reader’s Score: 0

Invitational Priority - Adult Education

1. To meet this priority, an applicant must include a plan that is coordinated with adult education providers serving neighborhood residents, such as those funded through the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act, as amended. Coordinated services may include adult basic and secondary education and programs that provide training and opportunities for family members and other members of the community to support student learning and establish high expectations for student educational achievement. Examples of services and programs include preparation for the General Education Development (GED) test; English literacy, family literacy, and work-based literacy training; or other training that prepares adults for postsecondary education and careers, or supports adult engagement in the educational success of children and youth in the neighborhood.

No

Reader’s Score: 0
### Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** PEACE Foundation DBA Northside Achievement Zone (U215N110034)  
**Reader #1:** **********

#### Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selection Criteria</th>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Points Scored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Need for Project</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Need for Project</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality of Project Design</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Quality of Project Design</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality of Project Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Qual. of Project Services</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality of the Management Plan</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Qual. of Management Plan</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Priority Questions

**Competitive Preference Priority**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competitive Preference Priority</th>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Points Scored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CPP4 Early Learning</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. CPP4 Early Learning</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CPP5 Internet Access</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. CPP5 Internet Access</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CPP6 Arts and Humanities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. CPP6 Arts and Humanities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CPP7 Affordable Housing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. CPP7 Affordable Housing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Invitational Priority**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Invitational Priority</th>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Points Scored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adult Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Adult Education</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Points Scored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>105</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions

Selection Criteria - Need for Project

1. Please respond to the sub-questions regarding the Need for Project.

**Reader's Score:** 15

**Sub Question**

1. The magnitude or severity of the problems to be addressed by the proposed project as described by indicators of need and other relevant indicators identified in part by the needs assessment and segmentation analysis.

**Strengths:**

The applicant provides indicators of need that demonstrate a pervasive pattern of racial and geographic disparity in North Minneapolis. The level of need is portrayed within tables that are provided on pages 86-87. The indicators identified align to education, family and community supports.

Results identified verify that only 24% of children in 3-8 grades, compared to 51% of children in Minnesota are at grade level in math. 28% of children are at or above grade level in reading, compared to 71% in the state. Currently, only 54% of students enrolled in High School from the Zone graduate.

Of the eleven schools in and near the Zone, ten are either low-performing or persistently low-achieving, with the remaining school not meeting AYP standards and likely to enter corrective action soon.

Only 29% of children entering kindergarten met literacy benchmarks, compared to the 71% of children in the District as a whole.

The applicant provides data indicators that substantiate need based on factors and findings which align with the housing and economic security, health, behavioral health, violence and crime factors within the NAZ community.

**Weaknesses:**

None

**Reader's Score:** 10

2. The extent to which the geographically defined area has been described.

**Strengths:**

The Northside Achievement Zone (NAZ) is a contiguous 13 by 18 block area in North Minneapolis. The applicant provides significant detail which defines this area for the purpose of this application.
Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. Please respond to the sub-questions regarding the Quality of Project Design.

Reader's Score: 5

Sub Question

Weaknesses:
None

Reader's Score: 25

Sub Question

1. The extent to which the continuum of solutions is aligned with an ambitious, rigorous, and comprehensive strategy for improvement of schools in the neighborhood.

Strengths:
The applicant proposes a continuum of solutions that include three NAZ pillars. Designed to engage parents with aligned education support, committed and innovating schools within a continuum of support service, and effective whole-family support programs. Through this process, NAZ proposes to build a "pipeline to college and career" by putting all three pillars into action.

Within each pillar, the applicant proposes multiple solutions that will be used to meet the specific outcomes expected.

Weaknesses:
None

Reader's Score: 10

2. The extent to which the applicant describes an implementation plan to create a complete continuum of solutions, including early learning through grade 12, college- and career-readiness, and family and community supports, without time and resource gaps, that will prepare all children in the neighborhood to attain an excellent education and successfully transition to college and a career, and that will significantly increase the proportion of students in the neighborhood that are served by the complete continuum to reach scale over time.

Strengths:
Children living with in NAZ currently attend 145 different schools. This broad attendance area creates a problem in implementing school-solutions for all children in the neighborhood. The applicant proposes developing an effective continuum of education services that run through selected Target Schools, including those which are located in or near the Zone.

Support by the family engagement services of NAZ and the educational services of NAZ Partners will enable the applicant to: 1) integrate the work of assigned NAZ Connectors and Academic Case Managers into the school process, 2) identify families most in need of NAZ services and will work with the NAZ Engagement Team to enroll students and their parents into NAZ, 3) provide progress data for NAZ Connect tool, and 4) participate as a full user of NAZ Connect for families in NAZ to support achievement plan goals and steps in real-time.

The applicant proposes building a Teacher Effectiveness infrastructure and has garnered the support of key decision makers (example: the Superintendent of Schools), to identify eight school leaders across
Sub Question

public district, public charter and parochial schools to represent eight of the nine Target Schools who were asked to join in a year long instructional leadership learning community titled the NAZ Principal Learning Community. This approach will develop the principals capacity to observe, evaluate and coach their faculty's teaching which will lead to improved instructional practices in classrooms.

Weaknesses:
None

Reader’s Score: 5

3. The extent to which the applicant identifies existing neighborhood assets and programs supported by Federal, State, local, and private funds that will be used to implement a continuum of solutions.

Strengths:
NAZ was created from a coalition of over 50 neighborhood programs and services. Of these 50 programs, 21 have emerged as lead organizations, playing a pivotal service-provision and strategic partner role in the Action Areas of NAZ. The applicant has provided a complete overview on the programs and to be services provided within Implementation Plan provided within Appendix F.

Weaknesses:
None

Reader’s Score: 5

4. The extent to which the applicant describes its implementation plan, including clear annual goals for improving systems and leveraging resources as described in paragraph (2) of Absolute Priority 1.

Strengths:
The applicant has provided a clear Implementation Plan within Appendix F. Additionally, the applicant has provided much of the same information within the formal discussion and introduction of the three pillars of their project design. Solutions discussed identify resources that will be either leveraged or have been already obtained.

NAZ currently raises $1.1 million annually to support the pilot project and the evidence-based-strategic plans of the Action Team that have begun to show progress over the past two years. NAZ proposes to work with new key funders to develop plans to replace any Promise Neighborhood funding that may be needed.

Weaknesses:
None

Reader’s Score: 5

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Services

1. Please respond to the sub-questions regarding the Quality of Project Services.
Sub Question

1. The extent to which the applicant describes how the needs assessment and segmentation analysis, including identifying and describing indicators, were used to determine each solution within the continuum.

Strengths:
Over the past four years, NAZ and their research and evaluation partners; the Wilder Research, and the University of Minnesota have completed specific needs assessment studies, and gathered administrative data. This information has been used to determine specific needs of the Northside children, and the number of children with the highest needs. These included: 1) careful analysis of education and related health, social and economic factors, 2) transparency in design, collection, analysis and interpretation of all needs assessment data, and 3) reliance on evidence-based procedures. (pgs 40-41)

The NAZ segmentation analysis and solution planning rests on at least nine primary sources of needs assessment data, all of which are identified on pages 41-43. Through the analysis process the applicant was able to identify disparities which have led to the identification of Action Areas and the formation of Action Teams. Through this third level of segmentation analysis eight solutions are proposed to ensure that children and families receive appropriate services to address their individual needs (pg 43).

Weaknesses:
None

Reader’s Score: 5

2. The extent to which the applicant documents that proposed solutions are based on the best available evidence including, where available, strong or moderate evidence.

Strengths:
Throughout the introduction of the three pillars that the applicant proposes using to frame the NAZ, solutions have been identified and are supported by evidenced-based solutions. The applicant further defines many of the solutions as either strong or moderate. Solutions are fully documented within the Implementation Plan found in the Evidence table that can be found in Appendix F.1.

Weaknesses:
None

Reader’s Score: 5

3. The extent to which the applicant describes clear, annual goals for improvement on indicators.

Strengths:
The applicant provides benchmarks and projected outputs within Appendix F.2: the Implementation Plan.

Weaknesses:
The applicant has not provided a clear overview of the annual goals for improvement that they expect achieve within the indicators selected. Internal evaluation, monitoring work and measuring impacts are discussed within the proposed project; however the applicant has not identified or discussed this section of the application sufficiently.

Reader’s Score: 3
Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. Please respond to the sub-questions regarding the Quality of the Management Plan.

Reader's Score: 43

Sub Question

1. Experience, lessons learned, and proposal to build capacity of applicant's management team and project director in working with the neighborhood and its residents; the schools described in paragraph (2)(b) of Absolute Priority 1; the LEA in which those schools are located; Federal, State, and local government leaders; and other service providers.

Strengths:
The pilot project with families within the NAZ project has provided a number of lessons learned and increased the applicants experience in working with school, community residents, business and civic leaders to address reform and community needs.

It is clear from the number of partners identified; the alignment with Target Schools, the Principal Leadership program and the solutions proposed that the applicant has worked closely with the LEA and with Federal, State and local government leaders to develop both the NAZ pilot project and the Promise Neighborhood application.

Through a series of community meetings to develop the NAZ project, over 50 organizational partners evolved. Together these partners have developed a shared infrastructure to streamline systems focused on families and children.

Weaknesses:
None

Reader's Score: 10

2. Experience, lessons learned, and proposal to build capacity of applicant's management team and project director in collecting, analyzing, and using data for decision-making, learning, continuous improvement, and accountability, including whether the applicant has a plan to build, adapt, or expand a longitudinal data system that integrates student-level data from multiple sources in order to measure progress while abiding by privacy laws and requirements.

Strengths:
The applicant identifies NAZ as a data-driven and accountable collaborative, committed to starting strong and continually improving over time. To help maintain an environment of continuous improvement, NAZ currently relies on three related sources of data, including; 1) annual household surveys to assess changes in community and family needs and conditions, 2) internal evaluation data related to program implementation and short-term outcomes to assess ongoing contributions of NAZ-sponsored solutions; and, 3) links to school district, local, and state datasets to create a robust, longitudinal assessment of the effects of NAZ efforts. (pg 56)

The applicant states that they will assure compliance with all federal and state laws, as well as to preserve the confidentiality and privacy of NAZ children and families, multiple protections will be implemented. (pg 61)
Sub Question

Weaknesses:
None

Reader’s Score: 15

3. Experience, lessons learned, and proposal to build capacity of applicant’s management team and project director in creating formal and informal partnerships, including the alignment of the visions, theories of action, and theories of change described in its memorandum of understanding, and creating a system for holding partners accountable for performance in accordance with the memorandum of understanding.

Strengths:
The Action Teams identified within the proposed project stem from the key service providers that deliver direct services to NAZ families. As such partners within the Action Teams commit to 1) use of evidence-based practices to design comprehensive plans to meet the needs of their focus areas, 2) align services and strategies around family Achievement Plan goals; and 3) participate in NAZ evaluation processes to assess and strengthen programs continuously.

Weaknesses:
The management plan does not address accountability in regards to fiscal management, program planning, curriculum alignment, community engagement, problem solving or the decision making process that will be utilized to address and prioritize program activities.

Reader’s Score: 8

4. Experience, lessons learned, and proposal to build capacity of applicant’s management team and project director in integrating funding streams from multiple public and private sources, including its proposal to leverage and integrate high-quality programs in the neighborhood into the continuum of solutions.

Strengths:
The applicant states that they have leveraged $1.1 million in support of the pilot NAZ Families project which began two years ago. (pg 63). The applicant proposes to develop a ‘robust and expanding gifts program, increase of corporate investors and will re-align existing government and foundations sources to fund proven effective solutions and drive the integration of the pilot tested services and schools. To support this scale-up a NAZ Resource Team comprised of key local foundation and corporate funders is in the process of being formed.

Within the MOU partner commitments for funding, in-kind support have been identified. Additional support for funding and support through in-kind services have further been identified in many of the letters of support provided within the appendix of the application.

Weaknesses:
None

Reader’s Score: 10

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - CPP4 Early Learning

1. To meet this priority, an applicant must propose in its plan to expand, enhance, or modify, an existing network of early learning programs and services to ensure they are high-quality and comprehensive for children from birth through the third grade.
Strengths:
NAZ proposes to meet all requirements for the Promise Neighborhood Competitive Preference Priority 4. Using an approach that integrates evidence-based solutions, NAZ will engage their comprehensive Early Learning Network that is based on the work of the NAZ Early Childhood Action Team to combine parent intent with a solid plan of action, and then connect high-quality services to support these plans. Using NAZ Connect tool and working with an Engagement Team, families will be guided in developing learning strategies as goals and steps in their NAZ achievement plan. (pgs 25-29)

Weaknesses:
None

Reader’s Score: 2

Competitive Preference Priority - CPP5 Internet Access

1. To meet this priority, an applicant must ensure that almost all students in the geographic area proposed to be served have broadband Internet access at home and at school, the knowledge and skills to use broadband Internet access effectively, and a connected computing device to support schoolwork.

Strengths:
NA

Weaknesses:
NA

Reader’s Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority - CPP6 Arts and Humanities

1. To meet this priority, an applicant must include in its plan opportunities for children and youth to experience and participate actively in the arts and humanities in their community so as to broaden, enrich, and enliven the educational, cultural, and civic experiences available in the neighborhood.

Strengths:
Through connections made by NAZ, the FLOW Northside Arts Crawl and the Minnesota Children’s Museum will be integrated and aligned within NAZ, giving them a higher profile within the neighborhood and the ability for more Northside adults, children and youth the ability to participate in the arts.

Weaknesses:
None

Reader’s Score: 1

Competitive Preference Priority - CPP7 Affordable Housing

1. To meet this priority, an applicant must propose to serve geographic areas that were the subject of an affordable housing transformation pursuant to a Choice Neighborhoods or HOPE VI grant awarded by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development during FY2009 or later years.
Invitational Priority - Adult Education

1. To meet this priority, an applicant must include a plan that is coordinated with adult education providers serving neighborhood residents, such as those funded through the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act, as amended. Coordinated services may include adult basic and secondary education and programs that provide training and opportunities for family members and other members of the community to support student learning and establish high expectations for student educational achievement. Examples of services and programs include preparation for the General Education Development (GED) test; English literacy, family literacy, and work-based literacy training; or other training that prepares adults for postsecondary education and careers, or supports adult engagement in the educational success of children and youth in the neighborhood.