

**U.S. Department of Education - EDCAPS
G5-Technical Review Form (New)**

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 11/04/2011 11:28 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: SGA Youth & Family Services (U215P110090)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Need for Project		
1. Need for Project	15	15
Quality of Project Design		
1. Quality of Project Design	20	18
Quality of Project Services		
1. Qual. of Project Services	20	19
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Qual. of Management Plan	45	42
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
CPP4 Early Learning		
1. CPP4 Early Learning	2	
CPP5 Internet Access		
1. CPP5 Internet Access	1	
CPP6 Arts and Humanities		
1. CPP6 Arts and Humanities	1	
Competitive Preference Priorities		
CPP7 Affordable Housing		
1. CPP7 Affordable Housing	1	
Invitational Priority		
Adult Education		
1. Adult Education	0	
Total	105	94

Technical Review Form

Panel #13 - Panel - 13: 84.215P

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: SGA Youth & Family Services (U215P110090)

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 a comprehensive description of community, family, and academic need. Indicators of the need to address poverty include statistics of single family households, teen births, unemployment rates, and annual income rates. Some of the statistics are relative to the greater city (Chicago), demonstrating the relative severity of the problem. Indicators of the need to address health concerns include statistics of infant mortality rate and obesity rate. The need to address crime is vividly demonstrated by the map on page 11, which shows Roseland as one of the most crime-stricken neighborhoods in Chicago. The academic indicators are especially impressive because the applicant has disaggregated statistics by each of the four target schools. In reporting achievement levels on standardized test, the applicant referred to the high percent of students not meeting standards as well as the relatively low percent of students who exceeded state standards. The inclusion of the low percent of students that exceeded state standards indicates that the applicant holds high expectations for all its students, aiming for achievement results beyond simply passing (pages 13-15).

Weaknesses:

None.

Reader's Score: 10

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

Strengths:

A map is included on page 7 that delineates the boundaries of Roseland. Along with the map, text explains the boundaries of the geographic area and the demographic composition (p.7). A brief history of the community is given that places the current social situation in context (e.g., the closure of the steel mills in 1960s led to the decline of the neighborhood).

Weaknesses:

None.

Sub Question

Reader's Score: 5

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

Reader's Score: 18

Sub Question

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

Strengths:

The applicant presents an ambitious vision on page 16 (i.e., "each child in Roseland will attain excellent education, will successfully transition to college and career and will contribute to their community"). A comprehensive theory of change addressing community building, family/community supports, education, and data-driven decision making aligns to this vision. Each of the four investment areas includes rigorous goals and strategic directions aligned with the applicant's vision (included in MOU)

The applicant is partnering with the Academy for Urban School Leadership (AUSL, p.34), which has managed one of the target elementary school's Turnaround model.

Weaknesses:

Although the applicant is partnering with the AUSL, there is little mention of specific strategies aligned with the current reform models in each of the four schools. Additionally, AUSL only manages one of the four target schools (Curtis Elementary), and there is no discussion of how it might work with the other three schools.

Reader's Score: 8

2. The extent to which the applicant describes a proposal to 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.

Strengths:

The applicant describes a thoughtful process to ensure that every part of the continuum will be aligned to a common goal. Specifically, the applicant outlines four core investment areas (community building, family and community supports, education, data-driven decision making). Rather than simply describing each area, the applicant aligns each core investment area with Promise Neighborhood goals, and then lists strategic directions that each area will take to meet the goals.

The table on page e48 demonstrates how each solution on the continuum will be integrated to achieve a common outcome that will lead to sustainable impacts. As shown on the table, the various community programs, residents, experts, and staff will contribute to each the advisory council, core investment work groups, and evaluation process.

The fact that the Advisory Board, composed of residents, educators, service providers, and civic leaders, has been working together for the past three years to implement this planning and assessment process, which is convincing evidence that the applicant has established the capacity and ability to undertake the strategic directions and work towards the Promise Neighborhood goals. Additionally, the multiple types of stakeholders (e.g., educators, community members, civic leaders, etc.) that worked together on the Advisory Board to design the planning process demonstrates the integration of services on the

Sub Question

continuum of solutions.

Weaknesses:

none.

Reader's Score: 5

3. The extent to which solutions leverage existing neighborhood assets and coordinate with other efforts, including programs supported by Federal, State, local, and private funds.

Strengths:

The applicant clearly values community input, and its core assumption for its logic model (p. e48) is that community change must be community-driven. The applicant proposes to involve community members in all aspects of the plan through an advisory board and core investment work groups, both composed of community stakeholders. Importantly, the applicant has given thoughtful attention to the organization of the advisory board and the core investment work groups to ensure that community stakeholders are involved from assessing needs, to planning solutions, to evaluating impacts. For instance, the core investment work groups will meet monthly to discuss research in their core investment area and to become familiar with evidence-based solutions appropriate for the community.

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.

Reader's Score: 19

Sub Question

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

Strengths:

The applicant describes how it will 1) plan early education programs using three different indicators that address children s developmental, health, and academic needs (p.28); and 2) address students at risk for failure in school using indicators of number of students at or above grade level and attendance rate. The applicant provides detail on how it plans to utilize the 40 Developmental Assets tool to create individual service plans for "at-risk" students at each of the four target schools.

The applicant will partner with American Institute of Research (AIR) to conduct a needs assessment for each of these indicators. Importantly, AIR will integrate community voice by working with the Core Investment Groups. The applicant has considered the data sources to use and describes each source in detail (pages 41-45). For instance, data on school readiness for Pre-K students will be obtained from the Teaching Strategies GOLD.

The applicant states that data will be the center of each Core Investment Work Group meeting and will be the primary factor driving all decisions.

Sub Question

Weaknesses:

None.

Reader's Score: 10

- 2. The extent to which the applicant describes how it will determine that solutions are based on the best available evidence including, where available, strong or moderate evidence, and ensure that solutions drive results and lead to changes on indicators.**

Strengths:

The applicant proposes to implement a variety of evidenced-based programs. For the first year of implementation, the applicant will prioritize Children Ready for Kindergarten and Children Proficiency at Core Subjects and has identified potential solutions based on best practice, experience of other Promise Neighborhood models, and data from the needs assessment (p.e50). Some of the specific evidence-based solutions include Early Head Start, which has a successful track record in inner-city neighborhoods, and the Strengthening Families Program, which has been evaluated by independent researcher in randomized control trials. The applicant will also partner with the Academy of Urban School Leadership (AUSL) to plan for education reforms. AUSL is an asset to the proposed plan because it has gathered evidence (e.g., student achievement data and attendance data) demonstrating its success in working with Curtis Elementary, one of the targeted community schools. The K-8 School Trajectory on chart on page 39 illustrates the increased student performance at schools working with AUSL. Notably, schools who have been working with AUSL for many years (e.g., TCA) demonstrate especially high achievement increases.

Additionally, the applicant explains that the Work Groups and Advisory Board will assess newly implemented services, such as the Community Schools Program and the Paraprofessional Student Advocate Program.

Weaknesses:

One item missing is the process through which the Work Groups and Advisory Board will assess the newly implemented services for evidence-based results. In the description of the newly implemented services, it would have been helpful if the applicant had included information about how the Work Groups and Advisory Board would determine the effectiveness of the services.

Reader's Score: 9

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

Reader's Score: 42

Sub Question

- 1. Experience, lessons learned, and proposal to build capacity of the 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.**

Sub Question

Strengths:

The applicant has a 40-year track record of working in Chicago's most challenged inner-city schools and has administered the Community School program at Fenger (one of the target schools) since 2008. The applicant has a deep relationship with the Fenger community because it provided counseling and support after the traumatic death of a student due to bullying in 2008. Additionally, the applicant has been working with other organizations since December 2009 in preparation for the planning grant and has established an Advisory Board composed of different groups of stakeholders.

Weaknesses:

There is no description of the applicant or partner involvement with two of the target schools (Wendell Smith Elementary and Frank Bennett Elementary). Although it might not be necessary for the applicant to have experience working with these particular schools, it is integral that the applicant explicitly state how it will network with educators and stakeholders from these schools to build working relationships.

Reader's Score: 8

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.

Strengths:

The applicant is partnering with AIR to oversee data collection, analysis, and reporting. AIR is a premier research institution and has more than 25 years of experience in education research that inform policy and programming decisions. Additionally, the applicant has already begun collecting data on Promise indicators, utilizing its ETO longitudinal data system that will be integrated with the Promise Scorecard system at the end of 2011. The applicant also stated that the Advisory Board will center its decisions on data analyses (p.51).

Weaknesses:

Because the applicant is bringing in an outside partner to oversee data collection, it is unclear how the data collection and analysis efforts will be sustained. It would be helpful if specific training was included to increase the community's capacity to conduct rigorous data analysis.

Reader's Score: 14

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:

During the past three years, the applicant has partnered with more than 30 years to start the planning process for Promise Grant. These partners include the Salvation Army Kroc Center, Chicago State University and Harris Bank. The applicant has also considered the capacity in which these partners will serve and noted the services each will provide (e.g., the Salvation Army Kroc Center will offer arts, recreational, health, and athletic programs, p. 32).

As described in the MOU appendix, the partners align with the applicant's vision and theory of change.

Weaknesses:

None.

Sub Question

Reader's Score: 10

- 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:

Seventy percent of the lead agency's revenue is from public grants and contractual services, demonstrating that the agency has the capacity to manage financial grants. The agency has also secured private funding in the past to supplement public support.

As a testament to the agency's commitment, it has already raised \$2.4 million for the project, including \$1 million endowment funds and \$1.4 million in operating funds for programs and planning.

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:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

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:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

Competitive Preference Priorities - 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.

Reader's Score:

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 11/04/2011 11:28 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 10/21/2011 03:54 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: SGA Youth & Family Services (U215P110090)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Need for Project		
1. Need for Project	15	15
Quality of Project Design		
1. Quality of Project Design	20	20
Quality of Project Services		
1. Qual. of Project Services	20	20
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Qual. of Management Plan	45	45
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
CPP4 Early Learning		
1. CPP4 Early Learning	2	2
CPP5 Internet Access		
1. CPP5 Internet Access	1	
CPP6 Arts and Humanities		
1. CPP6 Arts and Humanities	1	1
Competitive Preference Priorities		
CPP7 Affordable Housing		
1. CPP7 Affordable Housing	1	
Invitational Priority		
Adult Education		
1. Adult Education	0	
Total	105	103

Technical Review Form

Panel #13 - Panel - 13: 84.215P

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: SGA Youth & Family Services (U215P110090)

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 impetus for this effort, the killing of a youth outside of his school, is profound. Roseland Children s Initiative began immediately after that murder in 2009. The lead applicant is SGA Youth & Family Services. The proposal outlines the chronic needs in the community, which include lack of easy access to public transportation, poverty, disparities in health, and more

Weaknesses:

None

Reader's Score: 10

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

Strengths:

There is a very thorough description of the area to be served, which is a densely populated, mainly African American (97%) area. The schools in the area are all low performing, and academic indicators for each are included. The area is 6.5 square miles and has a population of 40,148.

Weaknesses:

None

Reader's Score: 5

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

Reader's Score: 20

Sub Question

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

Strengths:

The plan is detailed, clear and the group has begun undertaking some of it already. There are four schools that will be part of the initiative: Curtis Elementary, Fenger High School, Smith Elementary and Bennett Elementary. The continuum includes four areas of investment: Community Building, Family and Community Supports, Education (by age group, from early childhood to career), and data-driven decision making. The Theory of Action is explained. Pages 17-21 outline each of the four areas of investments.

Weaknesses:

None

Reader's Score: 10

- 2. The extent to which the applicant describes a proposal to 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.**

Strengths:

The Logic Model created is impressive, and includes all of the core pieces that the Promise grant required. It is included on page 26.

Weaknesses:

None

Reader's Score: 5

- 3. The extent to which solutions leverage existing neighborhood assets and coordinate with other efforts, including programs supported by Federal, State, local, and private funds.**

Strengths:

There is ample participation from the neighborhood, and also from national partners. Programs already in existence are mentioned and will be integrated. The Planning will be a community-directed process.

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.**

Reader's Score: 20

Sub Question

- 1. The extent to which the applicant describes how the needs assessment and segmentation analysis, including identifying and describing indicators, will be used during the planning phase to determine each solution within the continuum.**

Strengths:

The preliminary solutions presented as part of the plan are based on the needs assessment, and will be continuously evaluated. An external evaluator, American Institute for Research, will oversee the analysis and segmentation in the first year. The Advisory Board and its Core Investment Work Group will guide the cradle to career continuum process and decisions.

Weaknesses:

None

Reader's Score: 10

- 2. The extent to which the applicant describes how it will determine that solutions are based on the best available evidence including, where available, strong or moderate evidence, and ensure that solutions drive results and lead to changes on indicators.**

Strengths:

The two main goals of the planning process are identified- and preliminary solutions based on evidence practice, as well as based on what has worked with other Promise grants are included. The main priority goals are expected to be 1) children ready for kindergarten, and 2) children proficient at core subjects. Preliminary solutions have been identified and outlined for each of these two areas.

Weaknesses:

None

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

Reader's Score: 45

Sub Question

- 1. Experience, lessons learned, and proposal to build capacity of the 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 Roseland Promise Neighborhood applied for this funding last year and state that upon the proposal being turned down, they continued full steam with their efforts to gain a Promise Grant, attending

Sub Question

conferences, trainings and other activities. The collaborative has several members who have become involved with other Promise grantees and have a deep commitment to the goals of the effort. SGA has a long history in the community, as well as the ability to sustain the program.

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.

Strengths:

The proposal outlines how the group has strengthened its proposal from last year. The proposal mentions the use of Efforts to Outcomes software from Social Solutions, which is intended for Promise neighborhood grantees. Data will be part of the leadership's scope of work and will also be included in the responsibilities that the Work Groups will be given. Decisions throughout the planning period will be based on the data gathered.

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 Theory of Action is defined. This group has spent a significant amount of time preparing for this proposal, and is implementing many of the Promise Neighborhood models of practice already. Partners will be engaged and kept accountable. The MOUs included in the proposal clearly state the commitment and active participation of the partners of the collaborative.

Weaknesses:

None

Reader's Score: 10

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 partners in this effort pledge their support to keep this program sustained, which includes identifying funding sources. The management team involved is in place, and well-trained for this initiative. A \$1 Million dollar gift has been committed by a private donor to secure the future of Roseland Children's Initiative. This is very impressive and demonstrates the serious commitment and enthusiasm by all involved.

Sub Question

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:

Weaknesses:

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:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score: 1

Competitive Preference Priorities - 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.

Reader's Score:

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 10/21/2011 03:54 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 11/04/2011 12:02 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: SGA Youth & Family Services (U215P110090)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Need for Project		
1. Need for Project	15	15
Quality of Project Design		
1. Quality of Project Design	20	20
Quality of Project Services		
1. Qual. of Project Services	20	20
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Qual. of Management Plan	45	45
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
CPP4 Early Learning		
1. CPP4 Early Learning	2	2
CPP5 Internet Access		
1. CPP5 Internet Access	1	
CPP6 Arts and Humanities		
1. CPP6 Arts and Humanities	1	1
Competitive Preference Priorities		
CPP7 Affordable Housing		
1. CPP7 Affordable Housing	1	
Invitational Priority		
Adult Education		
1. Adult Education	0	
Total	105	103

Technical Review Form

Panel #13 - Panel - 13: 84.215P

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: SGA Youth & Family Services (U215P110090)

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 Roseland area is not accessible by Chicago Public Transit, leading to the isolation of residents from services and employment, as well as a hospital trauma unit. A detailed listing of the poverty, health, crime, and educational statistics of the area paint a community (p e31-37) whose fortunes have changed since the closing of factories in the latter half of the 20th century (p e30).

Weaknesses:

None.

Reader's Score: 10

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

Strengths:

The initial phase will focus on a 60-block area in the South Side of Chicago, with eventual plans to scale up to 200 blocks (p e30). The area is bordered by 111th Street, 115th Street, Lowe, and Michigan Avenues (p e30, chart e31).

Weaknesses:

None.

Reader's Score: 5

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

Reader's Score: 20

Sub Question

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

Strengths:

Two of the schools are Turnaround Schools supported by teacher professional development (p e56-7). The model is consistent with the US Department of Education's definition of a restart model, and local schools operating under this model have achieved strong results.

Weaknesses:

None.

Reader's Score: 10

- 2. The extent to which the applicant describes a proposal to 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.**

Strengths:

Based on the applicant's well-conceived Theory of Change (p e38), the applicant has four Core Investments on which it will conduct Continuum Planning, and community input appears to be essential to the process (p e43).

A detailed discussion of how different agencies will fit into that continuum illustrates the overarching vision and philosophy of the group. (p e75-77)

Weaknesses:

None.

Reader's Score: 5

- 3. The extent to which solutions leverage existing neighborhood assets and coordinate with other efforts, including programs supported by Federal, State, local, and private funds.**

Strengths:

A plethora of services exist in the neighborhood, which well-complement each other and whose coordination would provide a strong continuum of services to residents. The area contains 9 early childhood/childcare programs, 9 OST programs, 7 job placement/ vocational/GED programs, 20 youth and family service programs, and 8 medical service providers (p e37).

The chart on p e62 provides a terrific visual aid for understanding the philosophy of the applicant team and the relationships among the various providers.

Sub Question

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.

Reader's Score: 20

Sub Question

- 1. The extent to which the applicant describes how the needs assessment and segmentation analysis, including identifying and describing indicators, will be used during the planning phase to determine each solution within the continuum.**

Strengths:

The applicant proposes an intensive Community Needs Assessment process, including bridges between professional and para-professionals. Of special merit is the plan to establish best standards to best assess children with special needs.

The description of the various data resources, along with strengths and weaknesses of the data, possibly proxy indicators, and discussions of the software to be employed (p e63-70) show that much analysis has already gone into conducting the most rigorous analysis possible.

Weaknesses:

None.

Reader's Score: 10

- 2. The extent to which the applicant describes how it will determine that solutions are based on the best available evidence including, where available, strong or moderate evidence, and ensure that solutions drive results and lead to changes on indicators.**

Strengths:

: The applicant utilizes evidence-based models in its delivery of Head Start (p e50-51). The applicant plans to implement the 40 Developmental Assets (40 DA) model for each student in the four target schools (p e53), as well as the Strengthening Families Program (SFP) to all high risk students identified through 40 DA (p e53).

SFP is recognized by the WHO, the National Institute on Drug Abuse, and the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (p e53).

Weaknesses:

None.

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

Reader's Score: 45

Sub Question

1. **Experience, lessons learned, and proposal to build capacity of the 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 inclusiveness and culture of respect engendered by SGA will do well to engage area residents. SGA offers culturally-appropriate services and works to serve clients in their language, including sign language (p e14). Clients can choose staff based on gender, race, or culture. Such client-centered treatment surely goes a long way toward strengthening relationships within the community.

In late 2009, SGA conducted focus groups of 25 residents to inform its programming and agreed on several principles (p e38). Parents also help determine services offered by the Community Schools Program, which the lead applicant coordinates at one area high school (p e55).

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.**

Strengths:

Over the last three years of operation, the lead applicant has conducted needs assessments and secured funds for data-indicated programs similar to the Promise Neighborhoods Model (p e54).

The team's program evaluator has 23 years experience in evaluating the implementation and impact of school innovations (p e85), including for several US Department of Education initiatives.

The applicant has funding from different Chicago agencies and has applied for \$1.4m in federal funds (p e92)

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.**

Sub Question

Strengths:

The applicant has developed a comprehensive Theory of Change and Theory of Action that will focus on four areas of Investment (p e38-43). An Advisory Board and a group of "partners" -- outside experts who will inform the Advisory Board on everything from program evaluation to real estate to educational practices -- will strengthen the system's coordination.

Detailed logic models illustrate the applicant's proposed methodology for handling the various inputs and outputs to achieve short, medium, and long-term outcomes (p e48-49). One of the lead applicant's leadership team has expertise in the coordination of multi-agency services. (p e87)

Weaknesses:

None.

Reader's Score: 10

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 grown impressively since its inception, and it continues to secure funding toward its future. Under the applicant's management, the lead applicant has grown in the last 12 years from an \$800K budgeted counseling agency to a youth and family service agency with a budget of \$7 million (p e86-7).

The agency has committed \$1.4 million to program planning and implementation of several data-driven programs, and a private donor has committed one million dollars to start and endowment fund to scale-up and sustain the project. (p e89)

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:

The applicant will expand Early Learning Network opportunities to area schools, churches, and parents to create a Community of Practice open to all children ages 0-5. The applicant will also build a bridge between professional and para-professional teams and track data regarding children served.

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:

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:

Head Start and school-aged children will have access to arts through the Salvation Army's Kroc Center. High School students participating in the Community Schools Program have enjoyed the opportunity to showcase their work at Parent Workshops, with the hope of increasing parental participation in the arts as well. (p e95)

Weaknesses:

None.

Reader's Score: 1

Competitive Preference Priorities - 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.

Reader's Score:

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 11/04/2011 12:02 PM