Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 10/30/2012 01:30 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: DC Promise Neighborhood Initiative, Inc. (U215N120029)
Reader #1:   **********

		Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions			
Selection Criteria			
Need for Project			
1. Selection Criteria 1		15	15
Quality of Project Design			
1. Selection Criteria 2		25	24
Quality of Project Services			
1. Selection Criteria 3		15	15
Quality of the Management Plan			
1. Selection Criteria 4		45	45
	Sub Total	100	99
Priority Questions			
Competitive Preference Priority			
Comprehensive Local Early Learning Network			
1. CPP 4		2	2
	Sub Total	2	2
Competitive Preference Priority			
Quality Internet Connectivity			
1. CPP 5		1	0
Arts and Humanities			
1. CPP 6		1	0
Quality Affordable Housing			
1. CPP 7		1	1
	Sub Total	3	1
	Total	105	102

Technical Review Form

Panel #26 - Implementation Panel - 26: 84.215N

Reader #1:   * * * * * * * * * *

Applicant: DC Promise Neighborhood Initiative, Inc. (U215N120029)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Need for Project

1. **The Secretary considers the need for the proposed project. In determining the need for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:**

Reader's Score: **15**

     Sub Question

1. **1a. Magnitude of Problems to be Addressed**

     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 magnitude of the problems addressed within the proposal is clearly detailed on pages 4-6. The applicant provided both a coherent narrative description of the neighborhood and supplemented the narrative with concrete indicators drawn from credible up-to-date sources as seen in the table on page 4. Examples of these sources include: 2008 DC Department of Health, 2006-2009 American Community Survey rom NIDC, and 2010 DC Income Maintenance Authority data. The comparisons of the neighborhood statistics to that of the city-wide statistics are significant and highlight the severity of the need and problems that the applicant aims to address in this proposal.

     The indicators listed on page 4 are also directly linked to and a result of the needs assessment and segmentation analysis performed by one of the partner organizations. The four major needs are well described on pages 5-6 and are supported with current data sources.

     Weaknesses:

     None found.

     Reader's Score: **10**

2. **1b. Geographic Area Description**

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

     Strengths:

     The applicant clearly defines the geographic areas on pages 6-11. The neighborhood is well described geographically both in its historical, physical, as well as current context. The Footprint Map on page 7 details the physical infrastructures that will be addressed in the proposal and maps out the community assets that are present in the proposed neighborhood. The applicant is successful in describing the context of the geographical area in relationship to the needs of the neighborhood and provides a strong and comprehensive argument for the need for the project.

Weaknesses:

None found.

Reader's Score: 5

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

Reader's Score: 24

Sub Question

1. **2a. Comprehensive Strategy and Solutions**

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

   Strengths:

   The applicant clearly defines its theory of change in fulfilling the Five Promises for Two Generations plan for the community on pages 13-24. The two-generation approach, as diagrammed on page 13, highlights the interconnectedness of the proposed strategy and how each strategy builds on each other over time in producing short-, mid-, and long-term outcomes. The continuum diagram on page 15 also outlines the full supports that the proposal aims to provide for children and families that span from pre-natal to adulthood and beyond. The strong components of the theory of change, two-generation approach, and the continuum diagram create a strong comprehensive strategy for the improvement of schools.

   The 12 key elements as detailed on pages 17-24 clearly define a rigorous and comprehensive strategy for the improvement of schools. These key elements build directly on the current needs of the neighborhood and the school sites and leverages partnership resources in building community and school capacity in improving student and parent outcomes. The ideas of these key elements are not presented in isolation as ideas of themselves, but within the needs of the local context and taking advantage of new and existing partnerships.

   Weaknesses:

   None found.

   Reader's Score: 10

2. **2b. Implementation Plan**

   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 explicitly and strongly defines the complete continuum of solutions in its two-generation model of supporting children and families in pages 25 to 42. The table on page 25 outlines the proposed continuum of solutions, and the solutions proposed are all interconnected with one another in building the full continuum.

The applicant makes a strong argument in each case of the proposed solution in redefining the needs of the neighborhood and builds from the organizational assets that are found within the area. For example, the applicant is advantaging and partnering with organizations such as the Community College of DC (page 31) to provide professional development training for early learning educators, and DC Public Library to provide literacy supports for both children and parents (page 31). The examples are a small sampling of the many diverse organizations that the applicant has tapped into in leveraging the partners expertise to support its continuum of solutions.

Within each piece of the continuum, the applicant clearly defines the need and the challenge as well as the theory of action that the solutions proposed would address. The applicant fully addresses the challenges of this work between and within each of the pieces of the continuum so that there would be no time or resource gap.

Weaknesses:

None found.

Reader's Score: 5

3. **2c. Identification of Existing Neighborhood Assets**

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 clearly identifies the existing neighborhood assets and programs in five areas of work on pages 42-44. These five areas of partnership include: city, health, community, education, and national support partners. The individual partners are clearly listed with each of their funding sources clearly defined on page 44.

These six areas create an integral set of building blocks that can be supportive of the applicant's implementation of its continuum of solutions. For example, for each of these building blocks, the applicant has listed the relevant partner organizations and the rationale by which these partners have been chosen to be involved in this proposal. For example, in the area of community support partners, the applicant explains how the East River Strengthening Collaborative in their current work of providing wraparound services for this community's most vulnerable families. Similarly, the DLA Piper Legal Clinic provides direct services to community members as well as provides key programming for youth in middle and high school. The applicant has strong justifications to how the programming and assets of these partners will be able to contribute to their theory of action and continuum of solutions.

Weaknesses:

None found.

Reader's Score: 5

4. **2d. Implementation Plan for Absolute Priority 1**

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 clearly describes its implementation plan on pages 44-48. The annual goals listed from 2013 to 2017 are realistic and robust goals that address the need for creating infrastructure, improving systems, and leveraging resources.

Each of the seven management systems targets specific needs in how the applicant aims to work with their internal leadership team and with its partner organizations. For example, the applicant recognizes that need to organize its service providers and technical assistance teams into Continuum Providers Innovations Groups. These groups are built from successful lessons learned from the Buffalo Promise Neighborhoods team and are intended to streamline and improve services. This specific group will utilize data to inform their progress of work so that teams can be transparent with the progress of work, and teams can learn from each other in building further capacity.

Weaknesses:

It is less clear how the seven management systems detailed on pages 45-47 overlap in formal or informal mechanisms. For example, it is not clear how the central core operations of the DCPNI management system will share knowledge and lessons learned across each of these smaller systems. The application could be strengthened if it defined how the central management system operated and led these seven smaller systems and/or described the relationships among these seven systems so that they can build on each others knowledge and expertise. It is unclear how these seven systems will work together in forming a coherent implementation plan.

In the case of the Principals' Council detailed on page 45, it is not clear who will be leading the work for this management system.

Reader's Score: 4

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Services

1. **The Secretary considers the quality of the services to be provided by the proposed project. In determining the quality of the project services, the Secretary considers:**

Reader's Score: 15

1. **3a. Needs Assessment and Segmentation Analysis**

   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 clearly describes the needs assessment and segmentation analysis. The process and the data sets used are well described on pages 49-50. The findings detailed in the table on page 50 provided a strong basis and evidence for the applicant to build its continuum of solutions as detailed in the need and project design portion of the application. Some sample data sources include: large quantitative data sets from the US Census, national citywide surveys, school climate surveys at target schools, focus groups with target populations served, and interview with teachers and school leaders from the four target schools.

   The data sets used are relevant, timely, and address the context of the neighborhood identified. The needs assessment does not depend on one type of data but uses mixed methods in developing a robust segmentation analysis.

Weaknesses:

None found.

Reader's Score: 5

2. **3b. Evidence-Based Solutions**

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

Strengths:

The applicant clearly documents that the solutions proposed are based on best available evidence and specifies how each major solution has had either strong or moderate evidence on pages 51-56. The documentation of evidence describes both the larger theory of action as well as strategies proposed in each area within the continuum.

Furthermore, in appendix F, the applicant fully details the references that support the proposed strategies on pages F-1 to F-12, and the tables on pages F-13 to F-24 provides specific analysis and details of each of the programs described in the proposal.

Weaknesses:

None found.

Reader's Score: 5

3. **3c. Description of Annual Goals**

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

Strengths:

The applicant describes clearly the annual goals for improvement on indicators. The progress over the project timeline is well outlined in the table on page 58. The metrics are well defined and the applicant has added additional indicators to help their team fully assess the progress of their proposed strategies. The applicant not only uses the measures mandated by the Promise Neighborhoods requirements, but also added relevant indicators that will help their team measure the progress of their two-generation approach.

The applicant's partnership with Urban Institute is promising. In their partnership, it is clear that the teams are working together to determine the individual factors that affect indicators. For example, the applicant understands the nuances of working with youth as different age groups and transition points have various needs and demands. It is through analysis of these nuances the applicant was able to build the annual indicator table on page 58.

Weaknesses:

None found.

Reader's Score: 5

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the experience, lessons learned, and proposal to build capacity of the applicant's management team and project director in all of the following areas:

Reader's Score: 45

Sub Question

1. **4a. Ability to Work with Neighborhood Residents**

   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 applicant clearly describes the experiences and lessons learned over the course of the planning process and recognizes the networks and partnerships that are critical in making the proposal successful. The key personnel detailed on page 62 have all done significant work in and around the proposed neighborhood and bring in a wealth of expertise as well as trust that have been built through time with local residents and community organizations. In addition, the applicant has built an extensive network of organizations and individuals who are supportive of this work.

   The applicant has detailed how it will not only provide services for children who attend school within the community but also those students who live in the community but attend schools in other places. The applicant is aware of the challenges facing this community and has a comprehensive management plan that actively engages with residents.

   Weaknesses:

   None found.

   Reader's Score: 10

2. **4b. Ability to Utilize Data**

   Experience, lessons learned, and proposal to build capacity of the 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 clearly details the plan to collect, analyze and use data for decision-making, learning, continuous improvement, and accountability on pages 64-69. The ETO management system described in this section is well described and meets the needs of the applicant. The partnership and consultation with Urban Institute will be helpful as the applicant integrates the ETO model into its context and needs of the work.

   The applicant has specified and defined the role of the Director of Quality Assurance on page 66 in how he/she will be working with the Executive Director in assuring that the right data is collected and used consistently and appropriately in decision-making, learning, continuous improvement, and accountability needs.

   The applicant specifies the school and student level data that it intends to collect on pages 66-67 and

addresses privacy laws and requirements in how it intends to capture, store, and utilize the data collected.

The applicant also details strategies for working with a national evaluator so that the lessons learned from this work can be shared more widely with other communities (page 69).

Weaknesses:

None found.

Reader's Score: 15

3. **4c. Ability to Create Partnerships**

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

Strengths:

The applicant has already built a strong network of partners who will take on this collective work. It was helpful to see the list of partners grouped into the four categories of providers, technical assistance, friends of the footprint, and city agencies, as stated on page 69.

The processes of engaging with these partners are clearly defined on pages 70-71. The MOU requirements and the alignment with the applicant s theory of action is explicitly stated and provides both parties with a strong level of accountability to each other in doing the work successfully.

Appendix C details the MOU with each of the key partner organizations and describes the commitment, both programmatic and financial, that each partner organization will bring to this proposal.

Weaknesses:

None found.

Reader's Score: 10

4. **4d. Ability to Integrate Funding Streams**

Experience, lessons learned, and proposal to build capacity of the applicant's mangement 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 clearly details the experience and lessons learned in leveraging resources during its two years of planning. Within the proposal, they have a strong cash and in-kind match that fully complements their proposed request.

Their leadership team includes a Director of Resource Development who is directly connected with the Sustainability Group diagrammed on page 63. The applicant s existing relationships will also help in building and securing possible future funding streams for this work. The applicant is fully aware of the challenges of the funding stream effort and details that in their three-prong approach on pages 75-76 in building their ongoing capacity to integrate their funding streams.

Sub Question

Weaknesses:

None found.

Reader's Score: 10

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Comprehensive Local Early Learning Network

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

   Strengths:

   The applicant clearly defines a six part integrated plan on pages 76-81 that will serve as a hub for the early learning programs network. The proposed strategies are based on the needs identified on page 77. The plan s intent is to build a more robust early childhood learning experience for children so that all participants supporting the early childhood work are part of a larger integrated plan in strengthening child development.

   Weaknesses:

   None found.

Reader's Score: 2

Competitive Preference Priority - Quality Internet Connectivity

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:

   Not applicable.

   Weaknesses:

   Not applicable.

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority - 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:

   Not applicable.

Weaknesses:

Not applicable.

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority - Quality Affordable Housing

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

   Strengths:

   The applicant describes the partnership with the District of Columbia Housing Authority in its winning application for the Choice Neighborhood Planning Grant.   The transformation plan described on pages 82-83 provides quality affordable housing for the neighborhood, and both organizations are working in sync with one another in supporting each other s efforts.

   Weaknesses:

   None found.

Reader's Score: 1

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 10/30/2012 01:30 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: DC Promise Neighborhood Initiative, Inc. (U215N120029)

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

		Points Possible	**Points Scored**
Questions			
Selection Criteria			
Need for Project			
1. Selection Criteria 1		15	15
Quality of Project Design			
1. Selection Criteria 2		25	23
Quality of Project Services			
1. Selection Criteria 3		15	14
Quality of the Management Plan			
1. Selection Criteria 4		45	43
	Sub Total	100	95
Priority Questions			
Competitive Preference Priority			
Comprehensive Local Early Learning Network			
1. CPP 4		2	2
	Sub Total	2	2
Competitive Preference Priority			
Quality Internet Connectivity			
1. CPP 5		1	
Arts and Humanities			
1. CPP 6		1	
Quality Affordable Housing			
1. CPP 7		1	1
	Sub Total	3	1
	Total	105	98

Technical Review Form

Panel #26 - Implementation Panel - 26: 84.215N

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

Applicant: DC Promise Neighborhood Initiative, Inc. (U215N120029)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Need for Project

1. **The Secretary considers the need for the proposed project. In determining the need for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:**

Reader's Score: 15

Sub Question

1. **1a. Magnitude of Problems to be Addressed**

   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 makes a clear and complete case for the need of the neighborhood identified. For example, in the chart on Page e25, the applicant indicates that the neighborhoods involved in the project have higher unemployment rates than the rest of the city; and there is a higher share of teenage births in the neighborhoods. These indicators of need were compiled from the Needs Assessment and Segmentation Analysis.

   The applicant also indicates the need for improvement in the schools within the neighborhood.   For example, at the Chavez High School only 59% of the high school students graduated. This is a lower percentage than the average of 72.3% of the District of Columbia Public Schools (Page e26).

   The applicant identifies need for improvement based on data regarding single mothers, teenage births and child health (Page e27).

   The applicant adds information regarding the single mothers and other parents in the neighborhood and their expressed need for more skills and knowledge to effectively understand their children's development (Page e30).

   Weaknesses:

   There were no identified weaknesses in this area.

   Reader's Score: 10

2. **1b. Geographic Area Description**

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

Strengths:

The applicant clearly identifies the neighborhood to be served and provides a clear map of the service area (Page e 28). The service area includes an area in Northeast DC slightly less than two miles long and less than one mile wide, comprised of seven contiguous neighborhoods. The area is isolated on three sides by the Anacostia Freeway, the Anacostia River and the Pepco electrical plant (Pages e27-e28).

The applicant provides a history and demographics of the area to specifically support the needs of the neighborhood (Pages e30-e31). For example, the applicant defines clearly a description of the schools of Kenilworth-Parkside and the enrollment history of those schools.

Weaknesses:

There were no identified weaknesses in this area.

Reader's Score: 5

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

Reader's Score: 23

Sub Question

1. **2a. Comprehensive Strategy and Solutions**

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

   Strengths:

   The applicant provides strong support for programming for early childhood learning and parental learning through providing prenatal education and literacy coordination.   This is part of the Five Promises for Two Generations strategy. This solution area has been developed with elements to achieve targeted outcomes for parents as well as for children. This provides the beginning steps of alignment with a strategy for school improvement in the early grades (Page e35).

   The applicant appears to have developed several ambitious and rigorous strategies for improvement of schools in the neighborhood. This includes developing and increasing teacher and school leader effectiveness, comprehensive instructional reform strategies, increasing learning time and creating community-oriented schools and providing operational flexibility and sustained support (Page e37).

   The applicant's support for the use of innovative and evidence-based instructional strategies is an example of a rigorous approach that appears to improve student achievement. For example, the applicant states, "Ongoing, high-quality job-embedded professional development and training is underway at all four schools (Page e39).

   The applicant identified strategies that include students with special learning needs. This assists in providing a more comprehensive approach to the strategies selected (Page e43).

Weaknesses:

It is not clear how the District of Columbia Promise Neighborhood Initiative (DCPNI) will provide support for the Professional Learning Community strategy. For example, the applicant states that the DCPNI has created a professional learning community called Teachers and Principals of Pupils of Promise, but does not indicate the role of the school and the role of the DCPNI in those efforts (Pages e39-e40). To add clarity the applicant needs to identify the roles of both the school and DCPNI.

Reader's Score: 9

2. **2b. Implementation Plan**

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 includes a chart on page e46 that clearly identifies the solutions that will be offered for Children and Youth and for Parents. These solutions appear to be inclusive of early learning through grade 12 and include family and community supports.

The applicant uses the chart on page e49 and the narrative to show at least one of the elements that will provide support of the continuum reaching scale over time. This strategy includes the number of mothers that will be involved in the mother's cohort. This appears to be a good approach as the applicant proposes to scale up to serve a total of 310 women. The approach also provides an ongoing individualized support for a 12 month period for those participating.

The applicant defines clearly in its implementation plan how it will serve students who attend school outside of the footprint. This will assure the significant increase of the proportion of the students in the neighborhood that are served by the complete continuum (Page e44).

Weaknesses:

There are no identified weaknesses in this area.

Reader's Score: 5

3. **2c. Identification of Existing Neighborhood Assets**

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 includes in the narrative and the chart on page e65 the involvement of extensive funding sources. Those include Federal, state, local and private funds. For example, in addressing family and community partners, private foundations, USDA, HUD, and DC Children and Family Services Agency provide funding for the project.

Weaknesses:

There were no identified weaknesses in this area.

Reader's Score: 5

4. **2d. Implementation Plan for Absolute Priority 1**

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 identifies clear annual checkpoints for installing and improving the DCPNI systems in the chart on page e69. For example, in 2013, the Partner data collection methods will be fully aligned with DCPNI's system.

The chart on page e69 uses the column entitled System Improvements to clearly outline the major events that will be occurring over the five year period. These events provide support for the goals set. For example in year one, the Early Warning System will be piloted in elementary schools. This event is clearly linked to the goals set regarding improved behavior in the schools.

The section of the chart on page 69 entitled Leveraging Resources is used to identify the funding and resources for the five year project. The applicant links the goals of the project and the work of the Sustainability Group by clearly identifying the responsibilities of the group during the five year period.

Weaknesses:

Although the applicant did identify seven management systems, some of these did not include a connection to the annual goals nor to the other systems. For example, on page e66, the applicant discusses the Principal's Council; however it does not clearly identify the role of that group in improving systems and leveraging resources.

Reader's Score: 4

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Services

The Secretary considers the quality of the services to be provided by the proposed project. In determining the quality of the project services, the Secretary considers:

Reader's Score: 14

1. **3a. Needs Assessment and Segmentation Analysis**

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 provides a clearly defined process that describes how the needs assessment and segmentation analysis were used to determine the solutions within the continuum (Page e70 and chart on page e71).

The DCPNI has clearly identified six key findings based on the needs assessments and segmentation. Those finding are described in the chart on Page e71 and include: Pockets of Need, Low Income Single Mothers, Quality and Availability of Early Education Programs, Access to Medical Care, Students with Learning Disabilities, and Service Fragmentation. This chart includes both the data collected and the decisions made based on that data.

Weaknesses:

There were no identified weaknesses in this area.

Reader's Score: 5

2. **3b. Evidence-Based Solutions**

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

Strengths:

The applicant documents that some of the Quality Early Learning Programs are clearly supported with moderate evidence (Page e73). This appears to predict the success of the programs chosen, which include providing additional early learning slots for DCPNI footprint children, training for early interventions for disabled youth, training for early learning professionals, and providing technical support to providers.

The applicant offers a solution to provide college mentors for high school students. This solution is supported by moderate evidence of success (Page e76).

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not make it clear if the strategies that will be used to link learning and civic engagement are similar to the evidence supported strategies. For example, it is not clear if California's Linked Learning Program is the same as the strategy that DCPNI is proposing (Pages e75 and e318). A more clear definition of the activities in the DCPNI linked learning with the addition of information as to how that directly relates to the research based on California s Linked Learning Program would provide the appropriate connection.

Reader's Score: 4

3. **3c. Description of Annual Goals**

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

Strengths:

The applicant describes clear, annual goals for improvement using the 12 project indicators that are mandated. The applicant also added two indicators that relate directly to the high incidence of teen births (Pages e77-e79). The chart on page e79 is a comprehensive review of those annual goals and the indicators of success.

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses identified for this area.

Reader's Score: 5

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the experience, lessons learned, and proposal to build capacity of the applicant's management team and project director in all of the following areas:

Reader's Score: 43

Sub Question

1. **4a. Ability to Work with Neighborhood Residents**

   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:

   As indicated in the chart on page e80 and the narrative that follows it, the applicant has made a concerted effort to obtain resident participation into this project planning. For example, the applicant identified that the Director of Resident Engagement will spend 100% of her time identifying resident needs and connecting with the community.

   The applicant indicates that it has worked with over 30 service providers in the area (Page e80).

   The leadership team and the project directors identified by the applicant appear to have a strong understanding and experience in programming that is similar to the strategies that are part of this grant proposal. For example, the executive director has a decade of experience in community development and program management (Page e 82 and Resume on page e132).

   Weaknesses:

   There are no weaknesses identified for this area.

   Reader's Score: 10

2. **4b. Ability to Utilize Data**

   Experience, lessons learned, and proposal to build capacity of the 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 clearly defines the process used to determine the type of management system to use for collecting, analyzing and using data. This process included building on experience and lessons learned (Page e85).

The applicant will utilize the Urban Institute as a key player in providing support for the system that will integrate student-level data from multiple sources in order to measure progress and allow for analysis (Page e86).

The applicant identifies clearly five strategies for working with the National Evaluator as part of the decision-making process based on collected data (Page e90).

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 15

3. **4c. Ability to Create Partnerships**

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

Strengths:

The applicant has developed a diverse set of partners from both inside the neighborhood and the area. These include providers, technical assistance, friends, and city agencies. It appears that the applicant has taken advantage of several key players in the community (Page e91).

The DCPNI has clearly set forth the formal partnerships through the MOU, the vision, theories of action and theories of change. The applicant has provided clear commitments from their partners (Page e 92 and MOU).

The applicant applied effectively the lessons learned during their planning year regarding the importance of communicating and outreaching to the community. This is evident in the development of the DCPNI Governance Board, which reflects the community stakeholders (Pages e92-e93).

Weaknesses:

There were no identified weaknesses in this area.

Reader's Score: 10

4. **4d. Ability to Integrate Funding Streams**

Experience, lessons learned, and proposal to build capacity of the applicant's mangement 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 does develop a Sustainability Steering Group to work on conducting a gap analysis of the funding sources. This approach appears to be an effective manner in leveraging additional funding sources (Page e95).

The applicant does indicate that previous efforts for fund raising have included positive cash results. For example, during the first two years of the organization, ▮▮▮▮▮▮▮ was provided from donors (Page e95).

Weaknesses:

Although the applicant indicates that plans have been made to add the Grants manager and Resource Development Positions, it is not clear how these positions will directly promote leverage for additional funding streams and/or integration of high-quality programs. Specific job descriptions for these positions would assist in providing assurances that high-quality programs will continue throughout the continuum of solutions (Page e95).

The applicant includes the establishment of a Development Directors Council, but does not clearly indicate how this Council will promote leverage for additional funding streams and/or integrate high-quality programs. Providing defined responsibilities for the council would improve the clarity as to how this council would promote the appropriate leverage (Page e96).

Reader's Score: 8

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Comprehensive Local Early Learning Network

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

Strengths:

The applicant includes a process that will expand early learning services by providing technical assistance to home-based providers, assist early learner providers with assessments and educate parents, teachers and providers about Early Learning Standards. This process appears to build effectively on the existing network to ensure that services improve and become more comprehensive (Pages e97-e99).

The applicant will be working with District of Columbia government agencies to improve evaluation standards. Using the QRIS system, the applicant will assure for high-quality programming for early learning in the neighborhood (Page e100).

Weaknesses:

There were no weaknesses identified in this area.

Reader's Score: 2

Competitive Preference Priority - Quality Internet Connectivity

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 - 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 Priority - Quality Affordable Housing

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

 Strengths:

 The applicant indicates the willingness to work in partnership with the Choice Neighborhood Planning Grant and the District of Columbia Housing Development to address the issue of affordable housing (Page e103).

 Weaknesses:

 There were no weaknesses identified.

Reader's Score: 1

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 10/25/2012 04:31 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: DC Promise Neighborhood Initiative, Inc. (U215N120029)
Reader #3:   **********

		Points Possible	**Points Scored**
Questions			
Selection Criteria			
Need for Project			
1. Selection Criteria 1		15	15
Quality of Project Design			
1. Selection Criteria 2		25	25
Quality of Project Services			
1. Selection Criteria 3		15	15
Quality of the Management Plan			
1. Selection Criteria 4		45	44
	Sub Total	100	99
Priority Questions			
Competitive Preference Priority			
Comprehensive Local Early Learning Network			
1. CPP 4		2	2
	Sub Total	2	2
Competitive Preference Priority			
Quality Internet Connectivity			
1. CPP 5		1	0
Arts and Humanities			
1. CPP 6		1	0
Quality Affordable Housing			
1. CPP 7		1	1
	Sub Total	3	1
	Total	105	102

Technical Review Form

Panel #26 - Implementation Panel - 26: 84.215N

Reader #3: **********

Applicant: DC Promise Neighborhood Initiative, Inc. (U215N120029)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Need for Project

1. **The Secretary considers the need for the proposed project. In determining the need for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:**

Reader's Score: **15**

Sub Question

1. **1a. Magnitude of Problems to be Addressed**

   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:

   Based on criteria provided by the applicant, utilizing the needs assessment and indicators required in the segmentation analysis, the severity of the issues faced by this community is quite evident. For example, half of the residents live below the federal poverty level; and unemployment is significantly higher in this neighborhood than in the rest of Washington DC (Page e25). Moreover, all four schools in the PN are either low performing or persistently lowest achieving (Page e26).

   The community is considered a food desert, has no direct access to grocery shopping, most residents cannot afford an automobile (Page e31), and crime persists throughout the neighborhood.

   Additionally, they have demonstrated through years of research and involvement of several partners, the teen pregnancy crisis in the community. The applicant has determined the rate of teen pregnancy can be a major driver in manifesting education and socio economic issues (Page e25).

   Weaknesses:

   No weaknesses to note.

   Reader's Score: **10**

2. **1b. Geographic Area Description**

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

   Strengths:

   The applicant describes the geographically defined area, including the distance, the physical location as well as the history of the community.
   On page e27, the applicant defines the area in Northeast DC as 2 miles long and 1 mile wide with seven neighborhoods. The community has one hundred families in an area surrounded by an expressway, closing electrical plant and parklands.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses to note.

Reader's Score: 5

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

Reader's Score: 25

Sub Question

1. **2a. Comprehensive Strategy and Solutions**

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

   Strengths:

   The applicant has set ambitious goals by aiming to work with two generations at once. While many programs focus on simply the young people, this applicant has learned from the research that working simultaneously with both children and their parents, especially parents with young children, yields strong results (Page e34).

   The applicant has a strong commitment from the schools within its footprint for reform and has agreed to partner with the DCPNI. They have also adopted a rigorous plan to turnaround the schools in the community. This includes a comprehensive strategy that contains support, training and development of teachers and leaders, addressing absenteeism, middle to high school transition, and empowerment training for parents to ensure they are aware of how to advocate for their children. These are indicators of a comprehensive strategy that will ensure that the numerous pieces that impact schools will be addressed. (Pages e255-257)

   Weaknesses:

   No weaknesses to note.

   Reader's Score: 10

2. **2b. Implementation Plan**

   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 describes a very thorough plan for implementation. Included in the application are very detailed explanations as to how each target group (i.e. birth to 3rd grade, teenage moms, parents, etc.) is engaged in the continuum of solutions from beginning to end. The applicant s focus on students who attend the target schools, whether they live in the geographical area or not yet still have access to the programming, ensures the community as a whole can still benefit and that no children are deprived (Page e44).

On Page e46, the applicant includes a chart that clearly lays out the continuum from early learning to college and career. In addition, the applicant includes the solutions for parents that correlate. This makes it clear to the reader how the solutions connect to one another and to populations being served.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses to note.

Reader's Score: 5

3. 2c. Identification of Existing Neighborhood Assets

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

Strengths:

The applicant indicates that the DCPNI began with a planning grant that engaged numerous partners (Page e23). Since then, they have continued to leverage existing and new partners who can provide services that will contribute to the continuum of services in their community. Many of these programs and organizations are funded by federal, state, local and private funds. This includes over 30 partnerships that meet this criterion (Page e65).

Some of the partners include DC Public Schools, State Farm Insurance, AT&T, Summit Fund of Washington and others. This demonstrates a diverse pool of funds to be leveraged through multiple streams.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses to note.

Reader's Score: 5

4. 2d. Implementation Plan for Absolute Priority 1

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 includes an extensive implementation plan. It is evident that a great deal of thought was put in to consider their 7 systems of creating infrastructure, improving systems and leveraging resources. These systems touch on each aspect of their work and will help them answer whether or not there is efficacy in their programming. They have also indicated the commitment to making changes in real time to improve programming and ensure effectiveness (Pages e65-68).

Through the use of the 7 systems, the applicant describes a process in which teams, such as the Cohort Improvement System and the Operations and Accountability System, will meet on regular basis to discuss data, make improvements to programming and processes, and identify ways to scale up (Page e66).

In addition, on page e69, the applicant provides a listing of annual goals for installing and improving DCPNI systems as well as leveraging resources. Some of these improvements include the implementation of the Early Warning System, refining the intake and referral system, and refining their policy agenda.

In terms of leveraging resources, the applicant lays out annual goals to increase funding commitments, better align funding streams and add self-funded partners where appropriate (Page e69).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses to note.

Reader's Score: 5

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Services

1. **The Secretary considers the quality of the services to be provided by the proposed project. In determining the quality of the project services, the Secretary considers:**

Reader's Score: 15

Sub Question

1. **3a. Needs Assessment and Segmentation Analysis**

   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 has utilized numerous forms of data collection to assess the need and conduct a segmentation analysis in its community. These include focus groups; national data sets, such as the census; city wide surveys; and interviews. Beginning on page e70, the applicant shows how they derived their solutions in the continuum from the needs assessments and segmentation analysis.   Based on the data collected, the applicant created what they call the pockets of need, which are areas in which the DCPNI had a disproportional number of children and families impacted as compared to the rest of the city. These include the higher rate of poverty, number of single parent homes, the lowest rating in quality standards for early education programs, and a higher rate of developmental delays among its students (Page e71).

   One way in which the applicant used these analyses is their decision to conduct home visits to pregnant and young mothers to provide support in parenting, job readiness and financial education. They make the connection that in order to reduce the rate of poverty, they must empower families with the skills they need to better sustain themselves early on (Page e71).

   Another example in which the applicant uses the analysis to determine a solution is their entire approach to work in a two-generation model (Page e89). The applicant states that based on the analysis, the two generation approach was developed as they learned this was a proven method to reduce poverty, the number of teen pregnancies and single parent homes. This is a clear example of data driven decision making and ensuring these efforts truly meet the needs of the community they wish to serve.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses to note.

Reader's Score: 5

2. **3b. Evidence-Based Solutions**

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 the appendices (Pages e315-326), the applicant includes a comprehensive list of research found to support the solutions to be employed along the continuum. On pages e73-77, the applicant lays out each proposed solution and the strong or moderate evidence used to determine the need for that particular solution. For example, the applicant plans to conduct home visits to pregnant women ages 12-20. This is based on a study in which home visits were made. The results showed stronger academic achievement, better attendance, stronger motivation and fewer instances of child abuse (Page e73).

Another example of the applicant s proposed solutions based on evidence is addressing chronic absenteeism and behaviors that impact learning through the use of an Early Warning System. The applicant cites research that used longitudinal data to track 13,000 students and found that along with other whole school reforms, attendance, behavioral and other interventions resulted in increased graduation rates.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses to note.

Reader's Score: 5

3. **3c. Description of Annual Goals**

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

Strengths:

The applicant describes very clear annual goals for improvement on indicators on page e79. Goals in the areas of graduation rates, having a medical home and enrollment in early learning programs are particularly ambitious. The increments in which the applicant anticipates progress are attainable. If achieved, these gains will make a significant impact on the neighborhood and community. More importantly, these outcomes will have a significant impact on the trajectory of the lives of young people in the DCPNI.

The applicant includes Promise Neighborhood required indicators within their annual goals. In areas where the numbers for individuals are already fairly high (i.e., attendance for 6th through 9th graders and students who have access to internet and computers), the applicant continues to set goals to ensure growth (Page e79).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses to note.

Reader's Score: 5

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the experience, lessons learned, and proposal to build capacity of the applicant's management team and project director in all of the following areas:

Reader's Score: 44

Sub Question

1. **4a. Ability to Work with Neighborhood Residents**

   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:

   It is clear that the applicant is experienced in working with the target community. This is evident in the use of focus groups, surveys, meetings and past work of partner organizations and individuals. Additionally, the personnel expected to conduct the work have over 50 years of experience.

   Through the accomplishments listed on page e23, it is evident that the applicant has learned valuable lessons in the creation of the DCPNI. The applicant includes lessons they have learned throughout the planning period, including how partners will be brought on, and strong communication and outreach to the community.

   Weaknesses:

   The applicant does not clearly indicate how they will build the capacity of their management team. On page e67, the applicant mentions that the organization will offer training to its staff in areas such as case management, conflict resolution and data collection. There is no mention, however, of how the organization will build staff capacity in areas such as coalition building or relationship management, as examples. Skills in data collection and case management are critical. Having the skill and ability to work well with residents, and manage collaborative efforts and stakeholders who are a part of these efforts, are also critical to the success of the project.

   Reader's Score: 9

2. **4b. Ability to Utilize Data**

   Experience, lessons learned, and proposal to build capacity of the 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:

   It is very clear that the applicant has developed a multi-faceted data collection and analysis plan that will enable them to make continuous improvements throughout the cycle (Page e87). For example, on page e87, the applicant describes the process in which they analyzed the current data collection systems of partners and determined which indicators will be used to properly evaluate the work in order to reach the expected outcomes. Additionally, the applicant has created a data system team responsible for meeting monthly and looking at ways to improve data collection efforts.

   The applicant has contracted with an entity to develop an accountability system for partnership to measure progress and performance of partners (Page e89).

The applicant appears to be deeply committed to a continuous improvement model led by data as they indicate they will create a system feedback apparatus provided by individuals being served. On page e89, the applicant indicates that the more feedback they receive, the more their understanding and theories of change will evolve. This is important because it demonstrates this applicant is more committed to the outcomes than the process.

The applicant addresses some of the most important lessons learned in data collection and usage, and those are simplicity, integration with multiple systems, and collaboration across partners. This approach is more likely to lead to collecting the right information to best inform their work (Page e85).

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses to note.

Reader's Score: 15

3. **4c. Ability to Create Partnerships**

Experience, lessons learned, and proposal to build capacity of the 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 strongly demonstrates the ability to form formal and informal partnerships created through the DCPNI. This is indicated in the MOUs signed by all parties that include strong language regarding being held accountable through performance measures (Page e92).

As demonstrated on page e80, the applicant describes some of the lessons learned through partnering with stakeholders in the PN community. For example, they learned the value of strong partnerships and buy-in from schools. To accomplish this, educators are a part of their management team, and the Principals Council has become a key decision making body.

The applicant also discusses the lessons they ve learned throughout their planning process, and the importance of clear messaging and direct outreach to the community (Page e92). One critical lesson learned is the importance of continuing to identify gaps and carefully select partners with the commitment and the capacity to fill those gaps (Page e93). These are significant lessons to have learned and then execute as the nature of implementing such a rigorous plan will require them to be flexible and open to change, yet focused on identifying and maintaining the appropriate partners to execute the plan.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses to note.

Reader's Score: 10

4. **4d. Ability to Integrate Funding Streams**

Experience, lessons learned, and proposal to build capacity of the applicant's mangement 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 indicated three valuable lessons they have learned regarding leveraging funding streams and have a robust plan to continue to leverage such funding. These are leveraging partner strengths, pursuit of direct government grants and engaging advocates (Pages e95-107). For example, on page e95, the applicant points out that in order to be sustainable, they must leverage the fundraising power of their partner organizations.

Additionally, the applicant has leveraged a large number of partnerships and services to meet the needs in the continuum of solutions, thus integrating high quality programs (Page e91).

Within the letters of support and MOUs (Pages e209-246), many partners include language that speaks to their continued support throughout the DCPNI based on successful outcomes.

These lessons are particularly important because developing a strong relationship with partners who can also serve as conduits to additional funding streams creates a stronger connection to the work for the partners, as well as a heightened sense of ownership. Accessing government grants directly is important for the DCPNI because, while they rely on the support from partnership organizations, they can begin building their own funding stream creating more sustainability for the applicant. Engaging advocates engenders stronger support for the mission of DCPNI and effectively expands the fundraising base to networks not previously known.

The applicant has established an impressive group of stakeholders, including members of the funding community, as part of their Sustainability Steering Group (Page e331).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses to note.

Reader's Score: 10

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Comprehensive Local Early Learning Network

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

   Strengths:

   It is evident throughout the application that the applicant is committed to enhancing both the quantity and quality of early learning programs. They are not only comprehensive for the targeted children in this cohort but also include the mothers of such children. The plan also includes providing support for child care providers and educators. There is a strong continuum ensuring a smooth transition even from child care or early learning opportunities to kindergarten (Pages e98-100).

   Weaknesses:

   No weaknesses to note.

Reader's Score: 2

Competitive Preference Priority - Quality Internet Connectivity

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:

   Not applicable

   Weaknesses:

   Not applicable

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority - 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:

   Not applicable

   Weaknesses:

   Not applicable

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority - Quality Affordable Housing

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

   Strengths:

   The applicant has indicated on page e103 that DCPNI has partnered with the DC Housing Authority in its grant for a Choice Neighborhood Planning Grant. The focus area for both grants is within the same residential area.

   Additionally, the MOU outlining this partnership is included in the application on pages e249-252 that includes an in-kind match, joint and coordinated program and a strong commitment to staff time and other resources.

   Weaknesses:

   No weaknesses to note.

Reader's Score: 1

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 10/30/2012 09:10 AM