

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 11/04/2011 11:29 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: South Bay Community Services (U215P110108)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Need for Project		
1. Need for Project	15	14
Quality of Project Design		
1. Quality of Project Design	20	18
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	
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	97

Technical Review Form

Panel #13 - Panel - 13: 84.215P

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: South Bay Community Services (U215P110108)

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 applicant provides numerous indicators of need, such as high poverty rates and low academic achievement on state tests. The explanatory text and the extensive table on pages 4-6 illustrates the level of need of the Chula Vista target area, Castle Park, in relation to the larger region, county, and state. For instance, the target area had a domestic violence rate 68% higher than the countrywide rate in 2009 (p. 3). These comparisons are important because they indicate a rationale for selecting the target need area over other areas in the state.

In the table on pages 4-6, the applicant has identified gaps in data availability and has proposed methods of collecting this data in the planning year. For instance, "the applicant proposes to collect data on parents who report talking with their child about the importance of college and career" through neighborhood door-to-door surveys.

Weaknesses:

In some instances, the chart shows that the target area (CVPN) has a lower level of need than the broader community. For instance, 67.75% of high school graduates from CVPN, while only 61.7% high school graduates in the region enrolled in college and only 34% of the state residents have a bachelor s degree or higher (p. 5). In these instances, it would be helpful if the applicant would explain reasons for this discrepancy, providing a stronger rationale for selecting the target area.

Reader's Score: 9

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 the target neighborhood, which spans 33 census blocks. Demographic data is also provided, demonstrating the neighborhood s prominent Hispanic population that is later considered in the proposed solutions.

Sub Question

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: 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 describes a strength-based position, and has assisted with implementing school reforms that emphasizes students strength, intelligence and resiliency rather than deficiencies (p. 9).

The applicant describes its chosen school improvement model, The Granger Turnaround Model (GTM) in detail and demonstrates how the model is correlated with increased student achievement. The GTM is rigorous and comprehensive, as evidenced by the four research-based (e.g., DuFour, 2009) intervention elements that underlie it. Namely, it is directed, timely, targeted and systematic (p. 8). The applicant will leverage the proven success of GTM to raise student achievement (p.11) and expand its implementation to the target schools. In addition to implementing the GTM in target schools, the lead agency will extend its wraparound support services for families in the neighborhood, acknowledging that school reform must be integrated with family and community supports to address the root problems that affect the entire neighborhood.

Community solutions are integrated with the school system. For instance, one proposed strategy is to "introduce academic component linked to classroom academics in YMCA s after-school program," which directly ties academic material from school to YMCA programs. The applicant plans to include all students, including those attending pre-K and a private school operated by St. Pius X Catholic Church (p. 14).

Weaknesses:

The applicant proposes to apply GTM, successful with two schools in the area, to five different schools without a consideration of each school's particular needs. Most notably, the applicant does not address the unique needs of the target elementary school beyond applying age-appropriate components of GTM (p. 12). For instance, the table on page 12-13 proposes to list "age-appropriate components," but the applicant is vague about what the "age-appropriate" changes will be (e.g., the statement "Enhance Intervention Through Universal Access with age appropriate elements of GTM" does not describe the age-appropriate elements K-5 students). This is especially concerning considering that elementary school is the district's lowest-performing school. The chart on pages 12-13 include specific strategies that address students in grades 7-8, 9-10, and 11-12, but groups all elementary aged students (K-6) in one category with only three strategies.

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

Sub Question

neighborhood to attain an excellent education and successfully transition to college and a career.

Strengths:

As described throughout the proposal, the applicant takes a strength-based approach and works to enable residents to improve the schools and community. The table on page 18 demonstrates how the applicant will build on extant partner services. Some of the evidence-based community assets include Health Development Services, Therapeutic Preschool, Children's Mental Health Services, and Gang Prevention. Importantly, the table not only lists existing neighborhood assets, but also explains strategies for how applicant will build on these assets. Many of the strategies include a discussion of increasing resident engagement and empowering youth and community members to take on leadership roles (p. 19).

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:

As described throughout the proposal, the applicant takes a strength-based approach and works to enable residents to improve the schools and community. The table on page 18 demonstrates how the applicant will build on extant partner services. Some of the evidence-based community assets include Health Development Services, Therapeutic Preschool, Children's Mental Health Services, and Gang Prevention. Importantly, the table not only lists existing neighborhood assets, but also explains strategies for how applicant will build on these assets. Many of the strategies include a discussion of increasing resident engagement and empowering youth and community members to take on leadership roles (p. 19).

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 will partner with SANDAG to conduct the needs assessment and segmentation analysis in close consultation with the community-based advisory committee. The applicant identified the 12 Promise Neighborhood indicators, as well as 3 additional family and community indicators (p.21). Data

Sub Question

will be both quantitative (e.g., achievement measures) and qualitative (e.g., focus groups, p.22). The applicant has identified the data sources (table 2, p. 4), many of which already exist (e.g., educational, health, law enforcement). New data sources capture the community members' voices, and include door-to-door surveys, school climate surveys (p.23), and focus groups (p.22). In proposing to collect new data, the applicant proposes to use rigorous research methods, such as systematic random sampling when surveying households (p.22). Commendably, the applicant has involved residents and Bilingual Promotoras to participate directly in survey data collection (p. 21).

The applicant has considered exactly which indicators the new data sources will measure, and describes these on pages 23-24. This demonstrates that the applicant has invested time and effort in preparing for the plan.

In conducting the segmentation analysis, researchers will collaborate with stakeholders to ensure that questions include factors that stakeholders believe might be associated with a higher need for assistance (p. 25). It is important that the applicant included the role of community members in determining variables for the segmentation analysis. The description of the segmentation analysis is detailed and sequential, demonstrating that the applicant understands the process and is prepared to undertake the data collection. For instance, the applicant specifies that it will perform correlation and regression (logic and multiple) to determine relationships between factors and indicators.

The applicant has also considered how the analyzed data will be used to develop a logic model that will then serve as a road map for developing solutions (p. 26). Importantly, the applicant has included all planning groups, which contain community stakeholders, to participate in this process.

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 lead agency, SBCS, systematically collects and analyzes data for all its programs, and a 2010 evaluation study found that SBCS employees' attitudes toward adoption of innovation in public sector service settings exceed those of providers in all other county regions (p. 27). Examples of evidence-based programs that SBCS already provides include Project SafeCare, Trauma Adaptive Recovery Group Education and Therapy, Hawaii Early Learning Profile, and others (see page 27).

The applicant has included numerous evidence-based solutions in its continuum, as indicated by a (*) on table 6 on page 18. Some examples include Newborn Home Visiting Program implemented by Scripps Mercy Hospital Chula Vista, The Granger Turnaround Model, and 'No Place for Hate' Anti-Bullying Program.

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 lead agency has been involved in the community for 40 years, providing children, youth, and family services. The agency includes a large (240) professional staff (p. 31), many of whom have bilingual capacities to serve the area's multilingual residents. Impressively, staff hiring practices attempt to mirror the community's racial, ethnic, linguistic, and social backgrounds (p.32).

The applicant demonstrates a strong relationship with community stakeholders, evidenced by prior committee meetings to plan the proposal as a collaborative effort (p. 33).

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 applicant has created a timeline for completing the needs assessment and segmentation analysis (table 7 on page 34), demonstrating that the applicant understands the steps necessary for implementing successful data collection and analysis. The applicant has experience using data to improve programs in other projects, such as the THP-Plus participant tracking system that collects demographic and outcome data for participants. The lead agency also already shares program data with schools where the agency provides school-based programming and is now well-positioned to expand and extend the data.

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 lead agency has 40 years of experience establishing collaborative partnerships, demonstrating a high level of trust and respect in the community. One example of a partnership is Health Development Services (p.37), which brings together hospitals, clinics, and other specialists to provide services to 0-5 year olds. Table 5 on page 15 illustrates how the proposed planning structure brings together a variety of partners, including schools, hospitals, clinics, City and County departments, institutes of higher

Sub Question

education, and parent and resident groups. As demonstrated in the MOU, all partner organizations subscribe to the theory of change that the community must work together with the schools to help economically disadvantaged children meet their highest potential.

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 current leadership team of the lead agency has overseen an expanding operating budget (from \$9 million in 2001/02 to 16.5 million currently, p. 39). The agency currently manages 56 Federal grants, indicating its experience in utilizing Federal funds. The current Development Consultant has written more than 340 grant proposals and brought in over \$22 million of mostly new funds for the agency.

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 11:29 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 10/21/2011 04:00 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: South Bay Community Services (U215P110108)

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: South Bay Community Services (U215P110108)

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:

Proposal addresses the need nicely. South Bay Community Services (SBCS) is the lead applicant and serves the City of Chula Vista in San Diego County. The Chula Vista Promise Neighborhood target area is Castle Park, which is mainly an immigrant neighborhood, with limited English language spoken by its residents, high poverty rates, gang activity and high incidence of domestic violence. Table 2 on page 4 presents a thorough list of Indicators, Data Sources and how the target neighborhood compares to the region, county and state as a whole. Where there are data gaps, it proposes to address them during the planning process.

Weaknesses:

None

Reader's Score: 10

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

Strengths:

The geographic area is well defined, with a description of the community's racial and ethnic makeup and street boundaries. The area is 33 census blocks and has 6,744 residents. A map is included.

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 information presented regarding the schools and how the models could benefit the educational outcomes is clear. The strategy is clear. The Granger Turnaround Model used by SBCS in the High School District is well defined and includes elements that are well positioned to provide a good strategy for this project. These have been proven successful and are research based and data driven. The model has been used by SBCS for over 8 years and it is research-based, data driven and has 4 basic principles: it is directed, timely, targeted, and systematic. This model will be brought into the Promise Neighborhood.

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 indicators are clearly presented and tied to both, academic and family / community factors. In addition to targeting the schools in the area, there will be an effort to reach children who live there and attend different schools. Saturate the neighborhood with a new way of thinking- no barrier will stand between a child and a college education and fulfilling career. This philosophy is apparent in the approach presented. Table 4 beginning on Page 12 includes the different components of the Academic Intervention Model, by grade/age grouping, from Age 0-5 to 12th grade.

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 neighborhood is one of limited resources and language barriers, but the project considers the community an asset and views it from a strength-based perspective. Funding for existing projects is solid, and each partner has already committed staffing and other resources.

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:

There is a good plan in place to contract with SANDAG to lead the data analysis. Additionally, different methods for data collection will be used as appropriate- so both primary and existing data will be utilized to determine solutions within the continuum. The community's perspective has been kept in consideration. Table 6 on Page 16 includes the list of Indicators in the Continuum, by age grouping, their Academic and Family/Community Support components.

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:

SBCS, the lead applicant, manages several programs that already emphasize evidence-based practices. A list of the proposed efforts is included on Page 18, and several of the efforts are further described. One good example of this best practice is the use of Bilingual promotoras, who will be used to conduct research. They have been found to be very effective with community-level efforts.

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.**

Sub Question

Strengths:

SBCS, the lead applicant, has over 40 years of history working with children and families in the region. The staff involved at SBCS, including those who will take a leadership role in the Promise Neighborhood effort, are deeply rooted in the community targeted.

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:

A Data Team will be established and it will meet often. The timeline is clear and specifically tied to activities, and is included on page 34 (Table 7). There is a process for keeping partners actively engaged and accountable. Each partner will be able to not only contribute, but also have access to the data for their own use and benefit.

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:

SBCS is well rooted in the community. This project has brought together a cross section of the key service providers and leading agencies in the community and there is a focused goal to align the vision in a culturally competent manner, with data as a driver. The MOUs that are included demonstrate an impressive commitment by everyone to achieve the goals of the initiative.

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 Development Team for SBCS will ultimately be responsible for identifying funding streams for the sustainability of the effort. SBCS has strong expertise in development, currently manages over 56 federal grants and has diverse funding from different sources. A Fundraising Committee has also been established to work with SBCS on this portion of the planning.

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 04:00 PM

Status: Submitted

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

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: South Bay Community Services (U215P110108)

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: South Bay Community Services (U215P110108)

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:

High unemployment rates, a lack of feeling safe in one's neighborhood, and an alarming domestic violence rate of 929 incidents per 1000 people underscore the need for assistance to the Chula Vista community. One positive was that CV's high school graduation and college attendance rates well-exceed state averages, a good base on which to build a strong community.

Weaknesses:

None.

Reader's Score: 10

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

Strengths:

The target area, Castle Park, is well-defined and covers 33 Census blocks in the world's busiest international border crossing (p e29).

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:

For eight years, the applicant has worked with the local school district on a research-based, data-driven academic model, the Granger Turnaround Model (p e30). Laudably, the model views children as being resilient and strong regardless of their home or community situation. The model demands excellence: weekly assessments and mandatory after-school instruction by credentialed teachers and trained college tutors ensure an accountability-driven culture where failure is not an option. (p e30-31).

The program has enjoyed very positive results, leading to a special designation by California (p e33) and now the application hopes to expand this success to five other schools as well as other children and families in the area. Additionally, one of the elementary schools has incorporated an Intervention Model that is showing good results (p e36).

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 applicant envisions a "saturation" of the CVPN with a continuum of services. The area has many providers already offering services, and some, like United Way, are looking to expand their efforts (p e42). The chart on page E40-41 is an excellent display of the continuum of services to be offered by topic, provider, and indicators to be addressed.

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:

As referenced above, the chart on e40-41 shows the large assortment of services already available in the target area and how they can be further utilized. Parents will play a large role in their children's academic growth through the Granger Turnaround Model (p e33).

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 charts on e26-29 show a well-conceived data plan, both in terms of the development of a baseline and in terms of identifying appropriate data sources. Data gathering will include public data sources, door-to-door surveys, focus groups, and community and supplementary school-based surveys. (p e43).

The applicant shows a clear interest and understanding of the many ways in which to approach the analysis of their data. Survey questions will be, where possible, drawn from national sources to allow for comparison (p e43). Grocery cards and other incentives donated by local businesses will encourage people to complete the surveys. (e43). The random sample methods to be employed are similar to those used by the US Census. (e44). The statistical analysis will segment population into three risk levels. This is all top-notch.

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 lists 13 different examples of evidence-based models already in place (p e49) and provides a detailed description of other models planned for implementation (e50-53). Additionally, many of the applicant's programs have been evaluated by universities and other outside firms. The charts on E40-41 show the evidence-based models already in use and where they fit into the continuum of solutions.

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:

Continuum planning will involve a great deal of community input. Youth and families are involved in the design of all services. The lead applicant's 240 workers and 100 volunteers reach 50K people annually, over 95% low income and 60% below the poverty line (e38). It has provided bilingual, culturally-competent services for 40 years and includes a "no wrong door" approach with staff stationed at multiple locations (e53).

In gathering data, the applicant will hire and train Bilingual Promotoras and residents to conduct surveys. (e43)

The lead agency is the city's most significant provider of affordable housing (e54). Over 1/3 of the agency's staff is from CV, and 4 of 9 upper managers graduated from local schools. Six currently live in CV. One third of the Board of Directors are low income South Bay residents (e54).

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 applicant's evaluator, SANDAG, has been the local evaluator on several national projects (e48). The methods described in the gathering, analysis, and attention to general IRB protocols and privacy standards are impressive.

The applicant appears committed to utilizing data to make adjustments for its delivery models. A 2010 UCSD study ranked the lead applicant with the highest ratings of employee openness toward adoption of innovation in public sector service settings (e49). The lead applicant has participated in a statewide participant tracking system since 2008 to make data-driven decisions about program effectiveness. (e49)

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 lead applicant has 40 years of experience fostering successful collaborations among a variety of service providers, including governmental agencies, law enforcement, and faith communities (e59). The lead coordinates many regional efforts with multiple collaborative partners.

The detailed MOU (e85-94) shows the commitment to a cross-section of agencies in promoting the CVPN Theory of Change and Theory of Action.

The appendix lists many in-kind matches offered by partners (e95-104).

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 lead applicant has grown from a \$1.2m budget in FY91/92 with assets of \$266,832 to a FY11/12 budget of \$16.5m and assets of \$11.8m. The lead applicant currently manages 56 federal grants and is independently audited annually (e62).

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 envisions a comprehensive early learning network focusing on children and families. Working with hospitals, Head Start, Home Visit programs, a Therapeutic Preschool, Preparation for Kindergarten Parent/Child education, and age-appropriate components of the Granger Turnaround Model as well as academic components to the YMCA's afterschool program, the applicant plans a strong continuum of services.

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:

The applicant has plans to tap the talents of the San Diego Youth Symphony, the Mooleo Theater Group, and the Visual and Performing Arts programs at middle and high schools to provide more arts education and opportunities for students and families.

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