

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 11/18/2011 12:50 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: United Way of San Antonio and Bexar County (U215N110053)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Need for Project		
1. Need for Project	15	13
Quality of Project Design		
1. Quality of Project Design	25	24
Quality of Project Services		
1. Qual. of Project Services	15	13
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Qual. of Management Plan	45	40
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
CPP4 Early Learning		
1. CPP4 Early Learning	2	2
CPP5 Internet Access		
1. CPP5 Internet Access	1	0
CPP6 Arts and Humanities		
1. CPP6 Arts and Humanities	1	0
CPP7 Affordable Housing		
1. CPP7 Affordable Housing	1	0
Invitational Priority		
Adult Education		
1. Adult Education	0	0
Total	105	92

Technical Review Form

Panel #4 - Tier II Panel - 4: 84.215N

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: United Way of San Antonio and Bexar County (U215N110053)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Need for Project

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

Reader's Score: 13

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 and risk factors found in the EPN population, many of which present significant problems and gaps in services. Gaps across the service areas and some that overarch the spectrum of service areas are listed and described. Pages 11-12. The EPN community has lost population over the last 10 years while the city of San Antonio has gained residents. The population data is shown comparing the 2000 and 2010 changes for racial makeup, which has increased for Hispanics and decreased for African-American. Comparing demographic data to the city of San Antonio shows that there is lower employment, and a large jump in children living in poverty, 125%. The median household income is dramatically lower, and education attainment by adults in the community shows are more than double the city numbers for adults who do not have a high school diploma. Page 4. The academic indicators show EPN students have a significant level of low achievement. There are a high number of children living in poverty, and of children who are English language learners. There is equally compelling needs data describing high risk factors for the targeted population such as the high mobility of students, low Kindergarten readiness, the lack of medical homes, low attendance and graduation rates, low numbers of students involved in college prep, and a low number of children enrolled in early childhood learning settings. Page 7. Healthcare needs, high crime rates and, many children with no access to out-of-school programs also present significant need in the neighborhood.

Weaknesses:

There is data provided that does not demonstrate a significant need when matched to the city, however the applicant has not provided comparison to state or national numbers for this data- for instance children under the age of 19, family size and owner-occupied housing. Page 4. It is unclear who is targeted in which schools, as the information is presented.

Reader's Score: 9

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

Strengths:

The Eastside PN covers 3.5 square miles and is identified by the US Census tract codes. It is located east of downtown San Antonio. The USPS zip codes are given. The highways and roadways that are the area's boundaries are named and the applicant states that military lies to the north. Page 3. There is a reference to decaying infrastructure. Page 4. There is a map on page 19 of Appendix F.

Sub Question

Weaknesses:

The applicant has not described the schools within the designated PN area. The applicant has not described where the schools are located in reference to one another, or in relation to the geography of the neighborhood.

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 EPN is described as a severely distressed area and as such is describing their response is being aggressive, multi-faceted revitalization plan. There is an understanding that school improvement and reform needs to be at the core of the revitalization. Page 13. The Theory of Change that drives the project begins with children be healthy and ready for school, parents engaged in the schools, effective teachers and curriculum, students that are motivated and adults that have high expectations for their children from Pre-K through college and career. The strategy is ambitious and comprehensive and the continuum of solutions is aligned with the strategy. The transformation model is identified as the approach for the persistently lowest achieving school, Sam Houston. Page 23.

Weaknesses:

There are 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.

Strengths:

The applicant presents a plan that covers the full range in a continuum of solutions. There is an array of specific solutions that focus on student learning and development in concert with other solutions that have been selected to build parental and community assets across the spectrum of ages and constituencies. The scaling up over time is addressed and is based on successfully implementing a solution to a targeted cohort and then increasing the range of implementation, and building from successes in a continuous course of action over the five years of the grant. In Appendix F under the Timing category the applicant describes the process and expected scaling up of the solutions, based on the review of data and results. The applicant does describe the extent, or specific percentages of changes anticipated against baselines, of the scaling up over time so it can be assessed as being significant. Pages 22-23, 28.

Sub Question

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses noted.

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 described their understanding that not only will school reform positively impact the community, but that the reverse is also been shown to be true. The applicant has listed and described community sources that offer a variety of services. Page 29. In Appendix F in the Approach sections for each Goal, there are community programs aligned with the implementation of each solutions. Funding sources are aligned with the solutions and most of the funders represent a range of public, private, and government-state, city, county and federal sources. The applicant addresses building capacity within their organization and for that of community partners. The applicant conducted an inventory of community assets to be sure that every resource and community organization was included.

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 applicant describes the policies that have been developed in the city government that now support the investment in and the support for revitalization of the EPN. This will encourage funders going forward. The professional development in the school district will improve systems within and between schools and administrators to facilitate programs and supports.

Weaknesses:

There are no clear annual goals that speak directly to improving system or leveraging resources. The descriptions of the processes and the implementation plans in terms of impacting systems changes and leveraging resources- financial and other- lack specificity and detail.

Reader's Score: 4

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Services

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

Reader's Score: 13

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.

Sub Question

Strengths:

The needs assessment and segmentation analysis was conducted by a local university. A School Climate Assessment was conducted and 15 resident focus groups were held. School data was collected from all school databases. The data was current and relevant, 2010, 2011. Data for the EPN and city was collected from the Texas State Academic Assessment inventories. Segmentation data was broken down by geographic pockets of need, ages, grades and characteristics of children's' conditions of need, Pre-K educations, graduation and absenteeism, and other student, family and community characteristics. The Advisory Board and other community stakeholders reviewed the assessment and analysis to ascertain what the areas of greatest need are and solutions were selected following a review of research and input from professionals. Pages 34-37.

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses noted.

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:

In Appendix F there are citations and descriptions of the evidence considered in selecting the best solution for the continuum of services. These are also summarized on pages 37-39. The evidence is current and relevant to the solutions being addressed.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does indicate if the evidence used for decision-making was strong or moderate. The process of reviewing the literature and other evidence was not fully described.

Reader's Score: 5

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

Strengths:

There is a chart on pages 39-42 that aligns each Program Indicator with the Needs Assessment and Segmentation data and the annual outcomes, goals for some Indicators for years 1 and 5, for others for years 1, 2, 4 and 5.

Weaknesses:

The applicant has not included annual goals for improvement on Indicators for all five years for any of the Indicators. There is no explanation as to why the annual goals are not given for all years.

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: 40

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:

There are community partnerships, with schools, the San Antonio School District, federal, city, state and local government representatives and other service providers are cited throughout the proposal supporting the experience of the applicant. The Planning Grant included residents in various roles, as Advisory Board members, as members of the School-Community-Parent Network, and as members of neighborhood organizations and agencies. Parents are a vital constituency of this project with solutions along the continuum specifically addressing the involvement and role of parents.

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not specifically address this sub-criterion in the narrative as there is a lack of detail to support the lessons learned, and the efforts and programs that will support building capacity in working with these organizations going-forward

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, 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 the lack of integrated data tracking system to monitor progress, evaluate effectiveness and maintain accountability as one of the significant barriers to successful service delivery. Page 12. The applicant is constructing a data warehouse that will integrate all levels and types of relevant data. This will be a longitudinal data base with rapid-time data systems that integrates student level; data. The privacy laws are cited as part of the collection and handling of all data. Page 56. There were multiple sources used to provide as complete an analysis as possible. The applicant cites lessons learned in the Planning Grant for the need of real-time exchanges that preserve confidentiality. The use of data for continuous improvement is described. There will be quarterly reviews of the data collected by the advisory Board and other key stakeholders through standardized and customized reports. Professional development for staff, administrators, Advisory Board members and key stakeholders is included. Page 57.

There is experienced staff assigned to the systems management.

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.**

Sub Question

Strengths:

The applicant has a history within the EPN and the city of collaborating with community organizations and providing management and services commensurate with this project's plan. In the planning process the Advisory Board and parents from the Family-School-Community Partnership conducted a multitude of sessions, groups, meetings and presentations in order to gather input from EPN residents and parents. In the MOU there are theories of actions and change as well as the vision of the project clearly articulated. The theory of change is also referenced in 2a in support of defining and describing the project's strategy and alignment of solutions to identified needs. All the partners have signed the one MOU and each has also provided a letter of support and commitment to the project, and describing the resources and services to which each partner has committed. Many of the partners- formal and informal- are listed. Pages 29-32. Appendix. The applicant cites five lessons learned during the planning process that will and is informing the implementation of their project going forward. Pages 29. The project's Vision is well summarized on pages 58-59, and all partners have committed to this. The Advisory Board's membership is listed along with the affiliation of each member. 65% of the members are residents of the EPN. Page 60-61.

Weaknesses:

The partners who have signed the MOUs and provided letters of commitment have not included their own theories of change and action or their visions and an explanation as to how their own global approach to the partnership supports that of the applicant.

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 matching funds that have been committed to this project are significant and extend for the five years. The applicant cites multiple funding sources covering public, private and government funds. The city of San Antonio has prioritized the EPN for investment which will facilitate the leveraging of funds. The applicant cites that a strong precedent has been established in funding, and in policy in city government to support the academic services and college to career programming. Page 62. The San Antonio School District approved a \$19.5 million technology, safety and security, facility renovations and additions career enhancements and improvements to recreation and athletic facilities at all school campuses in the EPN. Page 63. By sharing the results from the Planning Grant with potential funders, the applicant has fostered a new source of funding on terms of matching dollars or other resources.

Weaknesses:

The applicant has not specifically described any lessons that they have learned in their work in the community that will be of benefit going forward in implementing the solutions, managing the projects or in any area that will facilitate the leveraging of funding stream. Pages 61-62. The applicant has not described what they have created in terms of a system for holding partners accountable for delivering the services, resources and support to which they have committed in their MOUs.

Reader's Score: 9

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 Local Early Learning Network that is proposed, is described as an expansion and enhancement of the existing Advisory Board. Following the needs assessment for the PN proposal it was clear that childcare and early learning was not reaching all the children in the area. Assessment showed that 95% of the children entering Kindergarten were lacking the skills needed to learn and develop. The Network will coordinate services; provide staff development and monitor data to be used in the longitudinal database for the PN. Pages 63-66

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 has not responded to this Priority.

Weaknesses:

The applicant has not responded to this Priority.

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:

The applicant has not responded to this Priority.

Weaknesses:

The applicant has not responded to this Priority.

Reader's Score: 0

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 PN will be working with the San Antonio Housing Authority in partnership with a HUD Choice City Planning Grant to renovate the Wheatly Courts public housing project. As part of this project Resident Leadership Program will be started, and job opportunities will be created. Both of which will impact the community residents in the PN area.

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses noted.

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.

Yes

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 11/18/2011 12:50 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 11/21/2011 05:31 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: United Way of San Antonio and Bexar County (U215N110053)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Need for Project		
1. Need for Project	15	13
Quality of Project Design		
1. Quality of Project Design	25	23
Quality of Project Services		
1. Qual. of Project Services	15	12
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Qual. of Management Plan	45	40
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
CPP4 Early Learning		
1. CPP4 Early Learning	2	2
CPP5 Internet Access		
1. CPP5 Internet Access	1	0
CPP6 Arts and Humanities		
1. CPP6 Arts and Humanities	1	0
CPP7 Affordable Housing		
1. CPP7 Affordable Housing	1	1
Invitational Priority		
Adult Education		
1. Adult Education	0	0
Total	105	91

Technical Review Form

Panel #4 - Tier II Panel - 4: 84.215N

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: United Way of San Antonio and Bexar County (U215N110053)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Need for Project

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

Reader's Score: 13

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:

There are 5,925 children and youth living in San Antonio's Eastside. The results of a PN planning grant needs assessment included a significant lack of access to high quality early learning. School mobility was cited as a significant need. Not one student that attended Eastside Promise Neighborhood (EPN) elementary and middle schools had been in the district for the entirety of their K-8 education (the drop off was predominately in middle school) (page 6).

Promise Neighborhood indicators of need and comparison figures are provided. Sixty percent of children living in EPN live in poverty, and the unemployment rate is over 50% (page 4). Nearly 100% of children attending the target schools are economically disadvantaged (page 5). The graduation rate at Sam Houston High School is 45.9%. Half of graduates enrolled in postsecondary education, and of those that enrolled in the community college, 93% required at least one year of remediation before they can begin their college work (page 10).

Segmentation and regression analyses identified the five indicators most predictive of poor educational outcomes - low skills at kindergarten entry, being over-age, poor performance on standardized tests, reduced attendance, and high mobility (page 10). The information from the needs assessment was used to identify gaps in resources (pages 10 - 12).

Weaknesses:

Academic data for grades four and five, as well as high school academic data, was missing.

Reader's Score: 9

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

Strengths:

The applicant describes the geographic area of the target neighborhood. The Eastside Promise Neighborhood covers 3.5 square miles and six census tracts east of downtown San Antonio. Zip codes and boundaries are provided. The applicant provides census data on population, ethnicity, housing, employment, and the percentage of children in poverty (page 4). A map is provided.

Sub Question

Weaknesses:

It was unclear if the information on page 7 describing student at-risk statistics is for all students in the PN, or only from target schools. Since a large percentage of students attend schools of choice outside of the SAISD, this needs clarification. The applicant needed to provide more descriptive information on the location and enrollments of all schools in the target zone to more fully describe the geographically defined area.

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: 23

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:

Sam Houston High School is identified as a persistently low performing school and is undergoing reform via the Transformation model (conversion to New Tech High). The interventions include increased Teach for America placements, improved rigor (as evidence by students taking AP examinations and SAT scores), and attention to college readiness. Wheatley Middle school is low performing. Bowden, Pershing and Washington elementary schools are also part of the project, but are not identified as low performing. The plan for school improvement has strong attention to literacy, and to critical transitions. Strategies at the elementary and middle schools include the adoption of an early warning system and Student Support Teams. There has been a recent realignment to a P-8 academy that will service all 6-8th graders and provide STEM instruction. 40 instructional coaches, charged with improving teacher practice, have been recently hired. Solutions and targets are provided on pages 22 and 23. SAISD will evaluate the impact of professional development on student achievement and teacher effectiveness (page 17). A Parent Room for college resources is under development and a KaBoom! playground grant is being sought, which, if awarded, will provide students with the opportunity to work with architects and engage in project learning. The school reform strategies are aligned with the goals of the PN.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were 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 Implementation plan provided in Appendix F details the continuum of services. A Choice Neighborhood Planning Grant is being used to support neighborhood revitalization, particularly for the Wheatley Courts Public Housing unit. The Student Support Teams and the Collaboration Coordinator will

Sub Question

provide a connective link. Page 17, SAISD will evaluate the impact of professional development on student achievement and teacher effectiveness. Parent to Parent support will be provided to all parents, regardless of school (page 28).

Weaknesses:

The applicant states that they will provide out of school services to students attending schools of choice in hope to convince parents who have sent their children out of the area to reconsider neighborhood schools (page 28). This causes some concern that parents choosing educational options will sense pressure or feel unwelcome.

The applicant did not clearly explain what the capacity is for New Tech High School and how students not attending the programming at High Tech will be served in the EPN. More specific information on establishing a college going culture throughout the school years, and assuring the successful transition to college and career (without need for remediation) would be helpful.

The plan to reach a greater proportion of children in the neighborhood over time was not clearly presented. The implementation plan did not indicate a year by year progression of number of students served in the community or indicate how the final participation numbers for each solution compare to the total number of children in the neighborhood so that total program impact can be fully understood.

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:

The applicant describes existing neighborhood assets on pages 30 through 31. Providers are listed in the MOU, match letters, and in Appendix F. These assets and programs are from a variety of fund sources.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were found.

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 describes system change goals on page 33. Leveraging of resources is noted in the MOU.

Weaknesses:

The system goals were very general. The applicant did not provide clear annual goals addressing how systems will improved and how resources will be leveraged throughout the project.

Reader's Score: 4

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Services

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

Reader's Score: 12

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:

Appendix F. explains how the results of the segmentation analysis are tied to EPN approach. Additional information on results of the segmentation analysis are found on pages 35-37.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were 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:

Appendix F. provides the evidence for each proposed solution.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not indicate if the solutions are based on strong or moderate evidence.

Reader's Score: 4

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

Strengths:

Pages 39-42 provide the baseline and target goals for each Indicator.

Weaknesses:

Annual goals are not provided for each indicator for all five years. Some of the listed goals are process, not outcome goals (for example, on page 39, 2013: 80% of students assessed using EDI. Here, the applicant should be providing the target number of children demonstrating age-appropriate functioning, not the percentage to be assessed).

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: 40

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 experience working with residents on page 46, and the schools on page 47, and, on page 54 provides further detail. A lesson learned is that parental engagement leads to parental empowerment that creates a shared accountability for student success. A second lesson learned was shaping of services by residents, parent and students for residents, parents and students. (page 48). The applicant will increase capacity via a Project Management: Concepts and Consultation workshop (page 49). The applicant has worked with the city government and Mayor.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were 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:

Data collection and analysis strategies include Desktop Analyst of Education Resource Group (ERG), used by SAISD for classroom performance data (page 43). There is attention paid to FERPA and HIPPA data privacy considerations. The EDI Early Development Instrument will be used to gather early childhood indicators. CI:NOW will integrate school data with community data. Real time analysis will be possible via the data warehouse. A plan to develop capacity is presented on page 57, and the applicant speaks to lessons learned. The applicant has been working with CI:NOW since 1998.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were 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 provides their experience managing partnerships. The applicant describes lessons learned from partnerships, including realizing the critical nature of parent engagement and empowerment which leads to shared accountability for academic achievement (page 47), and the importance of involvement of residents (page 48).

Sub Question

Weaknesses:

The MOU did not contain each partner's theory of action and theory of change, and how these align with the proposed promise neighborhood. The applicant did not present a system to hold partners accountable.

Reader's Score: 7

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 describes the multiple programs and funding streams they have managed on page 46 and on page 54. The applicant describes the integration of funding streams for this project on page 62.

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not fully detail their lessons learned or plan to build capacity in this area.

Reader's Score: 8

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's plan attends to both formal and informal early childhood providers. The applicant plans building information channels on multiple platforms (page 63). Early learning services are described on page 64. A Director will be named to oversee the network. Assessment of children will occur to determine project impact.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were 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:

The applicant did not address this competitive priority.

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not address this competitive priority.

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:

The applicant did not address this competitive priority.

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not address this competitive priority.

Reader's Score: 0

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 EPN efforts will occur alongside work being done with a CHOICE Neighborhood planning grant.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were found.

Reader's Score: 1

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.

Yes

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 11/21/2011 05:31 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 11/17/2011 06:19 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: United Way of San Antonio and Bexar County (U215N110053)

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	25	24
Quality of Project Services		
1. Qual. of Project Services	15	13
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Qual. of Management Plan	45	43
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
CPP4 Early Learning		
1. CPP4 Early Learning	2	2
CPP5 Internet Access		
1. CPP5 Internet Access	1	0
CPP6 Arts and Humanities		
1. CPP6 Arts and Humanities	1	0
CPP7 Affordable Housing		
1. CPP7 Affordable Housing	1	1
Invitational Priority		
Adult Education		
1. Adult Education	0	0
Total	105	98

Technical Review Form

Panel #4 - Tier II Panel - 4: 84.215N

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: United Way of San Antonio and Bexar County (U215N110053)

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 states that the community infrastructure, both built and social, is decaying and has contributed to a 10-year population base loss of 2.6%, compared to San Antonio's gain of 10%. As a result the families remaining in the EPN catchment area are younger, poorer and have less education than the rest of San Antonio.

Need is substantiated by a strong overview on the social and demographic changes since 2000. Community indicators demonstrating students at risk, economically disadvantaged students, Limited English proficiency students are presented by school to be served and in comparison of either the State of Texas or the San Antonio School District. (pg 4-5)

Inadequate access to high quality early learning programs, struggling school, over-age students, low graduation rates, poor health conditions and insufficient or ineffective supportive services provide significant and persistent challenges to the EPN target area.

Indicators, outlining, Educational Programs, Family and Community Support Program and Projects show a distinct difference between children within the EPN target area and either the city of San Antonio or the State of Texas. (pg6)

The applicant states that the EPN needs assessment, segmentation analysis, asset inventory and focus groups supply a clear picture of the widespread challenges to educational achievement and neighborhood instability. The segmentation analysis Table on page 10 provides a strong overview of findings.

Gaps in services and within educational program services and instruction have been identified and presented, page 10 - 11.

Weaknesses:

None

Sub Question

Reader's Score: 10

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

Strengths:

The applicant provides a good description of the geographic area that will be served, including the schools that will be included within this project. The applicant states that the area to be served is within the San Antonio Independent School District and includes six Title 1 public schools, of which includes one middle school and one high school. (pf 4)

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: 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:

Through the work conducted by the planning grant, the applicant proposes an integrated framework for existing and planned Eastside revitalization, using school improvement and reform throughout the feeder pattern that they have identified. (pg 12)

To implement their plan, the Advisory Board has agreed to remain participatory and oversee the implementation grant.

The applicant proposes key in-school initiatives, examples include; early childhood system of care, improving literacy skills, embedded science, technology, engineering and math (STEM), and instruction on all core-subjects - through career to college readiness.

Key out of school components include; improving the capacity of afterschool programs to foster increased physical activity and extend school day learning, enhance opportunity for supportive service provider to meet community needs, neighborhood safety, crime reduction, healthy children are among the components being addressed. The continuum of solutions is provided in a modified overview on page 18.

The applicant identifies that they are already addressing three in-process strategies to meet reform needs. These include: 1) addressing the issues around declining enrollment, 2) increasing teacher effectiveness by hiring instructional coaches and assigning new teachers to a mentor their first year and providing professional development. 3) Working together with all feeder schools in the EPN to jointly build a STEM pipeline.

Sub Question

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:

The applicant outlines a complete continuum of solutions and provides an overview on page 22-23. The applicant provides a thorough discussion on the services to be implemented and has provided examples of how solutions will reach beyond the classroom and into the community, supporter greater involvement by children who attend Choice schools.

Two primary methods of community redevelopment are planned, it is expected that these will help increase neighborhood stability and revitalization. The first involves aligning the housing redevelopment of Choice Neighborhoods with the educational reforms being implemented. The second calls for the assembly and co-location of resources at two of the schools, both of which are easily accessible.

The applicant states (pg 27) that, in response to the Continuum of Solutions features wider availability of high value out-of-school programs, for which all EPN resident children and youth will be eligible and recruited.

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:

Through a series of panels during the planning grant process, the Advisory Council found that there is a diverse array of services, however, the providers typically do not have the capacity, either financially or organizationally to make real progress meeting the community needs. They also found that little coordination between services exists and that high quality external providers may be needed to help fill the existing gaps in services.

Through a day spent walking every block within the EPN, advisory council, UW staff and program partners were able to conduct an inventory of community assets, parks; parks, churches, record business, housing conditions - all of which provides an additional confirmation on the conditions and gaps that exist.

Four strong partners have been provided, all align to one or more of the funding streams; Federal, State, local and private. All four are actively engaged in the development and support of the EPN.

Weaknesses:

None

Reader's Score: 5

Sub Question

- 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 states that supportive policy changes include three strategic shifts in the local status quo, these include; 1. SAISD must continue its three-year effort to intensify professional development services for teachers and administrators, 2. UW, the City and partners must pursue data-drive decision-making and accountability practices, in additions they need to agree to a shared set of measurable performance goals, 3. UW, the City and partners must agree to synchronize previously disparate investments to financially support implementation of the continuum of solutions and ensure continuity and scaling up. (Pg 33)

Weaknesses:

The policy changes proposed are not aligned with clear annual goals, and they do not discuss leveraging of resources - a clearer overview is needed to ensure that this segment of the application has been developed.

Reader's Score: 4

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Services

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

Reader's Score: 13

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 shares that through a completed comprehensive needs assessment, a segmentation analysis, a regression analysis, a school climate assessment and 15 focus groups, all stipulated program and project indicators were assessed and elevated the most critical gaps and at-risk sub-populations. (Table - pg 10-13) The applicant further identifies the methods and approach that was used to collect data and analysis it for the purpose of this application.

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:

Within the Appendix F the applicant provides substantial documentation on the research that was conducted to identify the proposed solutions. For example, pg 2 of the Appendix provides a strong overview of the evidence that supports Early Childhood Education, model classroom project, friends, family, neighborhood care, parent involvement and nutrition/fitness that align to EPN Children are ready for kindergarten. On pages 38 - 39, the applicant provides a recap of the highest priority solutions for

Sub Question

EPN

Weaknesses:

The applicant has not discussed indicated that evidence being provided is strong or moderate based upon their findings.

Reader's Score: 4

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

Strengths:

Annual goals and indicators are identified, pages 29 - 42. Goals are provided within a broad based indicator and supported by EPN need assessment findings.

Weaknesses:

The applicant has not provided goals for each year of the project. They have provided a baseline for year 2012 and a final goal expectation.

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: 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 cites many examples throughout the application of their work with the neighborhood to conduct needs assessment and planning activities during the initial planning year. Alignment with schools, the San Antonio School District, City of San Antonio is also well documented. This project is developed in part with United Way, a collaborative organization deeply embedded in helping communities connect with community-based services.

As the project lead, United Way has an extensive background and experience working within the community, facilitating collaborative projects and providing fiscal oversight for funds that align to Federal, State, local and private sources. The applicant provided several examples of recent work and projects they are involved in. (pgs 45 - 46)

The EPN has learned through experience with UW that this organization has the reputation as a superior fiscal agent and administrator as well as a compassionate convener and problem solver. Through these efforts UW has earned the recognition of being the 'community-table'.

The applicant further states (pg 47), that through their partnership experience valuable lessons are applicable to EPN, including strong evidence that parental engagement leads to parental empowerment and parents realizing that they are their child's life-long educational advocate. When that happens, shared accountability for academic achievement become possible.

Sub Question

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:

UW, SAISD and CI:Now will construct a data warehouse that meshes educational, environmental and family indicators. SAISD's existing data repository will be expanded with the help of a consultant to enable collection, analysis and report of the EPN program and project indicators.

Lesson's learned from the planning grant have advised a warehouse development and the need for real time exchanges that preserve confidentiality. The applicant states that the new system will repeat these elements in interfaces between and among multiple project partners.

SAISD and CI:Now will monitor in-coming information and share critical elements with all partners to allow continuous program improvement. (pg 56) Information will be shared with the Advisory Board and key stakeholders on a quarterly basis.

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 applicant discusses partnership and collaborative efforts during the planning year that were conducted during their community inventory and focus meetings. Lesson learned from these activities helped them realize that many of the services within their community are not ready or able to provide support at the level needed. This finding has lead them to look further a field to find support through City, School, state and Federal sources to enhance and provide services needed.

Stakeholders identified have signed on to the formal MOU for this proposal. In additions, partners have developed and agreed to a shared theory and all are aligning their internal resources to contribute to the desired change. (pg 57)

The applicant has provided a table, pg 54, which identifies the capacity and EPN Partner experiences that meet this area of need.

Sub Question

Weaknesses:

The partners identified have not indicated how they propose to provide support to meet the alignment of the visions, theories of action, and theories of change that have been identified. The applicant has not provided a system for holding partners accountable for performance in accordance with the memorandum of understanding.

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 provided a comprehensive profile of management, proposal to scale up additional staffing to provide management of the proposed project and the role management staff will have to ensure that this project has appropriate levels of oversight. (pgs 49 - 54)

Through a grant received by UW, IBM will conduct a one-day Project Management: Concepts and Consultation workshop on the basics of project management with related exercises, application of management concepts that are relevant to the EPN project.

The applicant states that through sharing the results of their planning grant with current and prospective investors, they have been able to obtain large match commitments.

Weaknesses:

The applicant has not clearly identified their proposal to leverage funds for this project.

Reader's Score: 9

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 states that they seek to improve the formal and informal networks of care with the provision of new learning opportunities for children and providers and the use of multiple content platforms, including public television and a community of practice that encompasses all types of learning venues, e.g. public and private child care centers, early learning centers. (pg 63) Comprehensive quality improvement strategies have been outlined, pg 64, outcomes for EPN children have also been developed and provided on page 65.

The shared goal between all involved is that every student will be able to read on grade level by 3rd grade and maintain that status through graduation. (pg 65)

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:

NA

Weaknesses:

NA

Reader's Score: 0

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:

Through a planning grant received by UW and Wheatley Courts, a Choice Neighborhood Planning grant will be implemented. The plan will stage redevelopment within the EPN, continuous case management to families will be maintained by San Antonio Housing Authority, an EPN partners. There are multiple points of intersection between the two grants, for example both are committed to improving educational outcome in neighborhood children.

Weaknesses:

None

Reader's Score: 1

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 11/17/2011 06:19 PM