

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 11/01/2012 02:18 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Dudley Street Neighborhood Initiative (DSNI) (U215N120043)

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	0
Sub Total	3	0
Total	105	101

Technical Review Form

Panel #29 - Implementation Panel - 29: 84.215N

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Dudley Street Neighborhood Initiative (DSNI) (U215N120043)

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 clearly details the magnitude or severity of the problems both in the narrative in pages 8-15 and then reiterates them in specific detail in pages 3-4 in appendix G based on their needs assessment and segmentation analysis. For example, the demographics detailed on page 8 of the narrative are detailed extensively in the social and demographics characteristics section of 10-17 of appendix G. Some specific examples of the demographics include the percentage of youth of color and percentage of families in poverty (page 8). The applicant states that 93% are youth of color, 40% of these children living in single parent households, 30.3% of the target population live in poverty, and 700 of their 1992 1-5 year olds live in poverty. These statistics highlight the need for families and young children in this target community.

Each of the charts found in the narrative section describing the need are further substantiated in appendix G. For example, each of the schools include a map, school highlights, enrollment by ethnicity, grade, gender, and related statistics of teaching staff. The applicant also includes the related state test scores highlighting the academic needs of the school populations. For example, on page 67 of 230 of appendix G, over 50% of the student population at Orchard Gardens are situated across the two indicators of needs improvement and failing in both English language arts and mathematics across all grades. The data for academic achievement is similar across the other target schools.

Another strong example found in this application is the asthma hospitalization rates for children under the age of 5 as detailed on page 95 of appendix G. The diagram clearly demonstrates the higher relative need as compared to the larger city statistics on asthma hospitalization rates for this age group.

Similarly, the community-based indicators listed on page 11 of the narrative highlight the need as compared to the city of Boston and to the state of Massachusetts. Across the board, the statistics found in the table on page 11 related to asthma rates, food insecurity, violence, teen birth ratio, student mobility, single parent rates, and poverty are significantly higher than in Boston and in Massachusetts.

The applicant details out the distress indicators of community health, unemployment, housing, and safety on page 12-13 of the narrative. All of these indicators are based from their needs analysis that is detailed extensively in appendix G.

Sub Question

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 describes the geography area of Dudley on pages 13-14 of the narrative and a detailed street and neighborhood map is found in the addendum on page 5 of appendix G. For example, the applicant states the boundaries and how this neighborhood is situated in the context of the larger city of Boston. The applicant also describes the specific needs in the areas of public transit, Level 3 and Level 4 schools that are failing and underperforming and the absence of certain community assets such as jobs, museums, and stores (page 15). Maps of the target neighborhood are also found in appendix G. Each of the maps found in appendix G relate to the location of specific type of assets or needs as it relates to the geographical area of Dudley in building a comprehensive picture of the target neighborhood.

In section F (pages 1-35) of Appendix G, the applicant provides additional geographic details that describe the neighborhood that includes how families are distributed in this area (page 6 of section F of appendix G), day care resources found in this area (page 10 of section F of appendix G), and owner-occupied housing (page 13 of section F of appendix G).

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 diagram found on page 17 and the narrative describes that the aligned and integrated high quality service delivery system is built on the pivotal role of resident leadership. The applicant understands that it is important for community members to take on key roles in developing a shared community vision. The applicant takes advantage of this key knowledge and uses the strength of the community members to build the team's own capacity and knowledge in moving the work forward in the continuum of solutions.

The applicant clearly lists the six critical management capacities as systems that will ensure high performance and continuous improvement for over 100 partners. The applicant also describes the

Sub Question

participant reach in each of the four continuum components: early childhood foundations, strong families and community, post-secondary completion and career readiness, and successful schools and students.

The comprehensive strategy for school improvement is detailed on pages 20-22. The four strategies are listed on page 20. Each of these four components, (1) cluster of high performing schools, (2) developing human capital, (3) ensuring progress of the most vulnerable, and (4) opportunities for students to pursue interests and build skills make up an ambitious and rigorous strategy for school improvement. Some of these strategies are based on current accomplishments and successes. These include the opening of their charter school and the strategy of extended learning time detailed in the inset on page 20.

The details for developing human capital and ensuring the progress of the most vulnerable are clearly described. The applicant provides concrete and specific details that focus on these two larger strategies on page 21.

Weaknesses:

It would be helpful to understand the student population of the charter school started by the applicant organization as described on page 20. For example, it is not clear whether students from out of the neighborhood are currently attending the school or could occupy seats in this school in the future.

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 fully details an implementation plan to create a complete continuum of solutions in appendix F. Appendix F outlines each strategy in detail as it relates to the targeted indicators, description of prior and current work, primary partners or organizational involvement, evidence from segmentation analysis and source of funding.

Within each proposed programmatic solution, the applicant details out estimated program costs and activity over the course of the project so that the complete continuum can reach scale over time.

On page 39 of the narrative, the applicant also diagrams out the three phases of work it plans to undertake. They include the following: planning and implementation, scale up, and full integration beyond year 6. Within this scale up graphic, the applicant has highlighted indicators and project outcomes over time for 10 schools, reaching 10,316 children from ages 0-19 (page 39).

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.

Sub Question

Strengths:

The applicant identifies and summarizes existing neighborhood assets and programs supported by outside funding on page 34 of the narrative. The applicant has grouped the assets into five types: development, commercial, recreational, social, and community based family and youth programs (page 34). The comprehensive number of each of these assets and notes are included in the table on page 34.

Extensive details of the community assets are found in appendix H, chapter K (BPI program and asset mapping). This provides a comprehensive view of the assets found in this neighborhood. Each of the organizations are described and detailed in how they fit in the continuum of solutions.

For example, the applicant describes how it intends to vet and link the high number of youth-serving programs for students through the proposal. The applicant acknowledges that the existing programs need to be matched with student populations who need the services the most, the programs need to be aligned to the academic agenda of the school, and the programs need to be part of a complementary learning for students in their village-as-campus model.

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 details its implementation plan within appendix F. Each of the programs have detailed implementation plans and clear annual goals associated with each program. In addition, the programs listed in appendix F include primary partners so that resources among network organizations can be leveraged.

The six critical management capacities listed in the table on page 40-41 describe how the applicant intends to improve systems across the myriad of support providers in the continuum of solutions. The three big goals of this management system are listed on page 40 in setting up a process for the applicant to improve the system and leverage resources. Annual goals for improving systems and leveraging resources are highlighted in the table on page 42 of the narrative.

Weaknesses:

None found.

Reader's Score: 5

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: 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:

Through the applicant 's needs assessment and segmentation analysis detailed in appendix G, their findings focused on a specific population of students who were foreign born, with 51% speaking a language other than English at home , young males of color, public housing residences, low-income families, and families who are housing and food insecure, and families heading by young parents (page 42-43 of the narrative). The applicant recognized that these populations, especially in early childhood, were the most vulnerable students (page 42). The applicant has used the outcome of these needs assessment and segmentation analysis indicators in creating each of their solutions in the continuum.

The solutions listed in appendix F are listed in four groups within the continuum of solutions. These four continuum of solutions include: (1) early childhood foundations, (2) successful schools and students, (3), post-secondary completion and career readiness solutions, and (4) strong family and community supports. In each portion of the continuum, the applicant describes the set of solutions in detail as defined by target indicators that are appropriate for each proposed solution.

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 the rationale by which the proposed solutions were selected with the best available evidence base. The applicant identifies the local capacity for implementation and relates how their local context.

Citations and evidence for each solution proposed within each of the continuum of solutions are detailed in appendix F. For each continuum of work, they have cited programs that fall in the range of moderate to strong evidence. Additional research evidence supporting the solution set for each continuum is clearly stated in the narrative in pages 45-49. For example, for their post secondary education evidence on page 47, the applicant clearly identifies multiple research evidence for having pathways that support young people 's successful completion of higher education and preparation for a career. This solution is part of a tiered effort that includes strengthening the vocational and post-secondary pathways, connecting youth to colleges, and linking jobs and career readiness with different fields in the real world. These more general solutions are tied back to specific programs as part of appendix f.

Associated bibliography to the evidence is present on pages 78-84.

Weaknesses:

None found.

Reader's Score: 5

Sub Question

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 on indicators on the table on page 49. The growth progressions annually are realistic and ambitious. The selected indicators listed encompass their continuum of solutions for youth 0-19 across the target schools. The applicant has also included the baseline planning year data. The baseline data collection demonstrates that the data on these indicators can be collected and a process has been in place to collect the data.

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 outlines how it has demonstrated experience in working to build capacity in the neighborhood and its residents on page 50. The applicant outlines four criteria that their team has met. These criteria include: working with neighborhood and its residents, working with schools and LEA, working with federal state, and local government, and working with service providers. Specific resumes and biographies are further detailed in appendix B. The applicant also outlines its rationale and two-prong strategy based on decades of community work (page 53).

The applicant addresses that one of its major lessons learned "is the power of coming together to identify common needs and then organizing, planning, and advocating for the resources and policies required to achieve the physical transformation of our neighborhood " (page 51). Much of the leadership from the applicant organization comes from the neighborhood and the capacity building of the team focuses on expanding active engagement throughout the neighborhood (page 51).

Operationally, the applicant details out a clear and coherent proposal to build capacity of the management team and project director in working with the neighborhood on pages 53-54. The applicant recognizes that the team serves in four major roles: organizers, conveners and collaborators, quality managers, and leadership developers and capacity builders (page 53-54). For each of these roles, the applicant details how it intends to build capacity within their own team, with partners, and with their

Sub Question

neighborhood participants and stakeholders. The applicant highlights an example in appendix J, chapter C in the excerpt of *For the People, By the People* that demonstrates their lessons learned in working with the target community.

On pages 56-63, the applicant discusses how it intends to build capacity to work effectively with the neighborhood and its residences, with the targeted schools, with their LEA (Boston Public Schools), with federal, state, and local government leaders, and with nonprofit service providers. For each of these groups, the applicant had detailed out a clear approach in how the team will work together effectively in producing their anticipated outcomes.

For example, in the work in building capacity of schools, the applicant details how the involvement of the principals in Partnership Councils creates a space to share goals, share best practices and skills, and compare notes on successes and challenges (page 58).

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 describes the prior experience of the management team as they've worked together for the past year in year one of planning. Their roles and work tasks for each of the data team members are described on page 64-65. Biographies and resume for these individuals leading the data work are also included in appendix B (resumes of key personnel). This team as listed on page 65 has deep prior experience in working in the local context and brings expertise in data collection, analysis, and data use to the proposal.

The applicant clearly outlines a proposal of collecting, analyzing and using the data for decision-making, learning, and continuous improvement as described in the schematic of their data system on pages 66-67. For example, the applicant's central data team supports works in tandem with the case management system and the web portal. These two systems serve as an intermediary for partners to input and access relevant data across the data system. The data system diagram on page 67 allows multiple secure entry points for partners and key stakeholders with the applicant's data team working at the core to drive data analysis for team members. It is this system, labeled in parts by A to F that outlines how the applicant team intends to manage the layers of complex data.

The applicant clearly discusses the issues of privacy laws as it pertains to confidential family and student information among their partners. For example, the applicant describes their data sharing authority with parents on page 71.

The use of a data management system called ETO is supporting their longitudinal database system. The applicant plans to work with a specific consulting firm called Jones Payne Group, Inc. that specializes in system integration (page 65). The applicant recognizes the need to strength their data system so that inputs, outputs, and all of the associated processes support effective data based decision-making, learning, and continuous improvement.

The MOU partners listed and detailed in appendix J, chapter 1 provides significant details on the data commitment of each partner.

Sub Question

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 describes their experience and lessons learned in maintaining effective partnerships with communities in their Lessons Learned paper referenced in their bibliography. The applicant has a clear plan in both their formal and informal partnerships in leveraging the lessons they've learned in supporting this type of neighborhood context. For the formal partnerships, the applicant has included individual MOU partnership agreements that detail each partner's vision, including alignment of the visions, and theory of action.

The governance structure is clearly defined on pages 73-74 and represents the diversity of the community so that the major population groups are represented as well as expertise reserved for key stakeholders. The board is part of this governance structure that will support accountability of the formal and informal partners in his work. The applicant's board functions are clearly outlined into three work groups: strategy group, data team, and accountability team (page 74). The accountability team functions to analyze the results of the work and help to make the difficult, but necessary determinations about future allocations of resources, & should partners consistently fail to deliver results (page 74). The applicant has clearly thought through with intention the types of organizing structures that would be necessary to support the ongoing formal and informal partnerships listed in the proposal. These organizing structures allow the applicant to build its own capacity over the duration of the project and support partnership accountability at the same time.

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 management team and project director in integrating funding streams from multiple public and private sources, including its proposal to leverage and integrate high-quality programs in the neighborhood into the continuum of solutions.

Strengths:

The current team has been managing over [REDACTED] of the neighborhood revitalization work (page 75). The applicant has worked with their partners in the use of the BPI plan so that the management team and project director can integrate the funding streams, assess impact, as well as leverage and integrate high-quality programs as part of its continuum of solutions. As detailed in appendix F, each program has assessed its program costs and activities in metrics that are coherent and translatable across solutions areas. For example, for the solution area of successful schools and students the partners have detailed out their funding in systematic way over the course of the five year proposal in the both program cost per year and estimate per-child cost per year.

The applicant clearly outlines the strategy by which they will integrate high quality programs as part of their continuum of solutions. The applicant states that strategy in the bullets on page 75. These sets of investments will be valuable for both the applicant and its partners as they work together in providing

Sub Question

robust resources to their community.

Leveraged federal investments are listed on the table at the top of page 76. The applicant has listed a total of [REDACTED] dollar leverage investment annually into this neighborhood. Aligned private investments are also detailed on page 76-77 and they total to over [REDACTED] dollar investment.

A funder s group has been established to support the distribution of resources in this continuum of solutions.

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 intends to build on an Early Learning Challenge grant won by one of its partner organizations (page 23). The Thrive by Five strategy is clearly detailed and diagrammed on page 24-25. The work involves a comprehensive list of local community support providers listed on page 24 and active parent and community engagement (page 25). The highlights listed on page 25 are extensively detailed in appendix F, chapter 1. The applicant describes each of the 11 early childhood foundation solutions and includes additional programs that support early childhood foundations that also support strong family and community supports.

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 is the Lead Neighborhood Partner for the city of Boston Choice Neighborhood Grant. In appendix H, item H, I, and J, the applicant has include the U.S. Housing and Urban Development Press Release for Choice Neighborhood (item H), City of Boston MOU for Choice Neighborhoods (item I), and Boston Housing Authority MOU for Choice Neighborhoods (item J). All of these MOUs and press release match the geographic location that the applicant has proposed in this application.

Weaknesses:

None found.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 11/01/2012 02:18 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 10/26/2012 02:38 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Dudley Street Neighborhood Initiative (DSNI) (U215N120043)

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	25
Quality of Project Services		
1. Selection Criteria 3	15	15
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Selection Criteria 4	45	45
Sub Total	100	100
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	103

Technical Review Form

Panel #29 - Implementation Panel - 29: 84.215N

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Dudley Street Neighborhood Initiative (DSNI) (U215N120043)

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 addresses all key indicators as defined by the needs assessment and segmentation analysis. In addition to basic demographic information and distress indicators, the applicant shares the fact that children who have lived in poverty and are not reading on grade level by 3rd grade make them 4 times more likely to drop out of high school. (p 11) This demonstrates the applicant's awareness of key academic indicators that determine students success and demonstrates a keen awareness of early warning dropout indicators. The applicant engaged Dr. Jennings from Tufts to oversee Dudley's needs assessment, as well as 900 residents in a variety of forums. (p. 8) The applicant states that 700 out of 1992 children 0-5 live in poverty. The applicant demonstrates high truancy rates (2.5% at Orchard Gardens) and suspension rates (26% at Dearborn MS). (p. 9-10) In the Dudley neighborhood, there are also high rates of violence (54%), teen birth rates (4.2%), and student mobility levels (42%), which all lead to instability and decreased chance of academic success for children. (p. 11)

Weaknesses:

No Weaknesses are noted.

Reader's Score: 10

2. 1b. Geographic Area Description

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

Strengths:

Dudley is a neighborhood that is 1.3 square miles in Boston that includes parts of Roxbury and North Dorchester. In addition, the applicant describes an area designated by the mayor as the Circle of Promise, a five square mile area that contains a majority of the cities level 3 and 4 underperforming schools. (p 14-15). The applicant also provides street and neighborhood maps, along with a description of limited public transit options in the Dudley Street neighborhood. (appendix G) It is evident that the applicant clearly addresses this indicator through the combination of the maps and description of the

Sub Question

target area.

Weaknesses:

No Weaknesses are noted.

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:

It is clear that schools are at the center of the applicant's proposal, (p. 20) and the applicant highlights the community school "village-as-a-campus" model, as the hub of a continuum of solutions. The applicant has opened one school and has been directly involved in the turnarounds within the proposed promise neighborhood zone. This demonstrates the familiarity and understanding the applicant has with the schools (p. 19-20), which is central to this application. As the schools are at the center of the continuum of solutions, the applicant presents four key principles to base their school and community initiative around. (p. 20) It is evident that these principals will help drive the continuum of solutions, further indicating the projects alignment with the needs of the schools. The applicant has opened a new charter school in partnership with the Boston City Teaching Residency and backed one schools extended day program where 80% of students participate at Orchard MS.(p. 20) The applicant is working to increase the quality of human capital in it's schools by using the new school as professional development hub for all neighborhood schools. (p. 20)

Weaknesses:

No Weaknesses are noted.

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.

Sub Question

Strengths:

The applicant clearly articulates cradle to career education and health supports designed to overcome the barriers of poverty. (appendix F) Specific supports are divided into the categories of early childhood, successful students and schools, and post-secondary completion/college readiness, all with the underpinning of strong family and community supports. (p. 22-32) The applicant clearly understands and articulates the necessary supports needed to support students through the academic pipeline. The applicant presents a thorough and well developed Implementation plan. (appendix F) This plan meticulously details the applicants intentions, and encapsulates a complete continuum of solutions, without gaps, that are focused on raising student achievement levels. In addition, the initiative is visually detailed (p. 39) and breaks out the 3 phases of work that clearly illustrates the number of children that will be affected by this program over time.

Weaknesses:

No Weaknesses are noted.

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 existing assets (p. 34), and makes the case that if these efforts are not aligned, they are not ultimately serving the students. The applicant fully details the scope of existing assets (Appendix H, Chapter K) and community partners as part of this wide-reaching proposal. A critical aspect of the applicant's proposal is to deepen the assets that already exist in the neighborhood (p. 35) and find mechanisms to take even greater ownership of their work. Here is another example of the applicant's commitment to build local capacity.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

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 realistically presents an effective implementation plan that is targeted at children aged 0-5 in the neighborhood and also grades k-12 attending schools within the applicant's zone. (p. 37) For each partner, the applicant shares target indicators, the program description, program cost, sources of funding, accomplishments, evidence, and what the implementation plan will look like. (appendix F) The applicant demonstrates the vision and ingenuity to bring a wide variety of service providers, government agencies and non-profits to work around one mission and vision. The applicant demonstrates investment in its own organization by working with the Bridgespan group and developing the six critical management capacities (p. 40), which certainly informed the description of the applicant's annual goals for improving systems and leveraging resources (p. 42).

Sub Question

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses are evident.

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's solutions were clearly determined by the needs of the community, and clarified by the segmentation analysis broken down by categories such as low performing schools, at-risk youth, and low income/high need families. (p. 44) The segmentation analysis is clearly delineated in a visual graphic organizer. (p. 44) This visual allows the reader to view the highlights of the segmentation analysis by category, making it clear how the needs of each population segment would be addressed through the proposed solutions.

Weaknesses:

No Weaknesses are noted.

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:

Each partner the applicant presents is rated in terms of their evidenced effectiveness by category including early childhood, school based solutions, post-secondary and family and community supports. (appendix F) In addition, the applicant self-assesses the evidence by category, with early childhood foundation evidence being "very strong" as compared to the strong families and communities evidence being listed as "moderate." This demonstrates the applicants ability to step back and assess the strengths and challenges of the massive project they have taken ownership of. School improvement evidence is quite strong demonstrated by the key target areas, including developing a cluster of high performing schools, developing human capital, focusing on best practices with the most vulnerable students, and expanding learning time and opportunities. (p.46) Details are described in appendix F. Strong evidence is cited a primary journals and studies, as demonstrated by the Race to the Top ECS report to support the school turnaround plan. (p. e245)

The applicant clearly documents its rationale (p. 45-47) and provides a snapshot of the evidence it has developed. For example, for successful schools and students, the applicant mentions expanding

Sub Question

learning time and enriching learning opportunities (p. 47) which carry a high degree of effectiveness.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

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's annual goals are clear, reasonable, and in progress, having started in 2011. (p. 49) This clearly demonstrates the project is in progress and underway and indicates the reasonableness of the future goals. The applicant not only provides projected goals, but baseline data to calibrate the projections (p. 49) that are clear and reasonable. For example, participation in early learning goes up 5% points from the planning year to year one, followed by 4% points, followed by a level off, which demonstrates reasonably improved progress.

Weaknesses:

No Weaknesses are noted.

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 addresses their organizational capacity work with the local LEA, schools, government agencies and other service providers. (p. 56-63) For example, the applicant has worked with Orchard Garden Pilot School as a member to help re-design the original turnaround plan that initially failed. The ability and capacity to lead a massive project as proposed is in large part to due to the applicants leadership ability, time invested in the proposed promise neighborhood, and the vast experience the applicant brings to the project. (52-54) For example, one of the applicant s main goals is to break down community "silos" by both providing the "structure, coordination, training, and strategic direction," along with working directly with the resident families of the neighborhood.

Sub Question

Weaknesses:

No Weaknesses are noted.

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 describes significant experience and expertise in using data systems for decision making, learning, continuous improvement, and accountability. (appendix B) The applicant's local expertise is evident. The applicant proposes to use data as a tool for continuous improvement for themselves, service providers, and end users, all while clearly understanding and taking precautions to protect user privacy. (p, 70-71) For example, data reports will be linked to specific indicators and solutions, which would reveal strategies that aren't working, along with a way to provide feedback in timely manner. A good example of this practice would be the applicant's ACT framework. (p. 70) One aspect of the applicant's use of data adapted from the CDC (p. 70) is particularly strong, in that the data forms a communication loop based on a set of indicators designed to determine whether strategies are working.

Weaknesses:

No Weaknesses are 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 brings with them 28 years of experience, and was founded on the notion of building collaborative partnerships. The organization has an intentional process for how they go about building relationships (p. 72) and acknowledge that sometimes it is better to let other people and organizations take the lead, demonstrating institutional wisdom. The applicant also plans to offer a type of "consumer feedback" approach for the project to ensure the necessity of work being done.

The applicant illustrates its rigorous governance, operations, and accountability system, which is driven by a board made up of working groups such as the strategy group, the data team, the accountability team, and the funders team. (p. 73-74) Therefore the applicant's structure allows for these key teams to meet and then report to their board. This is open to the public and would promote great transparency both within and outside the organization.

It appears as if the organization has great oversight without being a "top-down" organization, which will significantly contribute to the success of the project (p. 74) since the teams described drive their work

Sub Question

Weaknesses:

No Weaknesses are noted.

Reader's Score: 10

4. 4d. Ability to Integrate Funding Streams

Experience, lessons learned, and proposal to build capacity of the 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 demonstrates a great deal of strength and experience in leveraging funds as demonstrated by the [REDACTED] leveraged for the applicants promise neighborhood (p. 75) from public, private, earned as well as contract income. (p. 75) Lessons learned are implied by the fact that investors have agreed to support, work with and finance BPI initiatives over a multi-year period. (p. 75-6) All local funders have agreed to use the applicant's plan and have secured MOU's (appendix F) demonstrating the project partners commitment to the plan. The applicant has aligned private investments and leveraged federal investments (p. 76) to improve the overall program quality. In addition, the applicant clearly makes the ask of, "if awarded, this grant will support the coordination and management costs...and the solutions, in turn, will be supported by our partners and the funding already secured. (p. 75) It is clear the applicant is looking enhance the quality and increase the effectiveness of their current initiative.

Weaknesses:

No Weaknesses are noted.

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 proposes to build on an existing program that involves multiple stakeholders, including a [REDACTED] [REDACTED] early learning challenge grant. (p. 23) With a PN grant, the applicant seeks to link data systems between the school system and health centers to better serve families and work closer towards school readiness.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

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 serves as the lead neighborhood partner in a Choice Neighborhoods [REDACTED] initiative, which geographically overlaps the proposed Promise Neighborhood zone. The applicant also has numerous banks of partners and solutions aimed at providing affordable housing within the parameters of the proposed promise neighborhood.

The applicant has a great deal of prior experience in the area and is well positioned (30-31) and (appendix F) Appendix H highlights a press release with the city of Boston highlighting the applicants work for the city.

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score: 1

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 10/26/2012 02:38 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 10/27/2012 12:33 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Dudley Street Neighborhood Initiative (DSNI) (U215N120043)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Need for Project		
1. Selection Criteria 1	15	14
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	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	
Arts and Humanities		
1. CPP 6	1	
Quality Affordable Housing		
1. CPP 7	1	1
Sub Total	3	1
Total	105	102

Technical Review Form

Panel #29 - Implementation Panel - 29: 84.215N

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Dudley Street Neighborhood Initiative (DSNI) (U215N120043)

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: 14

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 clearly identified challenges facing youth in the Dudley Street Neighborhood. The applicant included a good overview of the community including its history and historical challenges on pages 4-6. The diversity of community challenges were highlighted along with poverty, family status, incarcerated parent, non-U.S. citizen parents, and almost all of the school age children attending low performing schools (page 8).

The proposal clearly identified the number of students served and the schools they attend (page 9) as well as the challenge indicators that were compared against the district and state. Student performance data was shared for the three target elementary schools and compared to the district, with specific population data being separated (ELL and SWD) on page 10.

Community based indicators of need were also shared by the applicant that created a stronger understanding of the out-of school challenges facing students from the Dudley Neighborhood (page 11).

Housing, safety and health issues were shared as being a significant impediment to the success of the students in the Dudley Neighborhood. Homeless family populations, students witnessing violence and family health issues (asthma, high blood pressure, heart disease and diabetes) emphasize the challenging dynamics facing Dudley neighborhood students (page 12-13). The applicant also shared that is not on the rapid transit system and many neighborhood adults spend an hour or more getting to work (page 14).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 10

2. 1b. Geographic Area Description

Sub Question

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

Strengths:

The applicant provided a strong geographic description of the neighborhood to be served that included proximity to downtown Boston and commute times (pages 13-14). A map was provided that visualized the community in relation to other communities in Boston. The map provided a clear map of the geographic area to be served. Appendix G provided maps of the Dudley neighborhood and assets within Boston's Circle of Promise initiative.

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not provide a detailed descriptive narrative or neighborhood map or graphic to assist in determining the neighborhood physical boundaries, proximity to major landmarks (downtown, airport, rail yards, etc.) that impact community and geographic challenges (river, mountains, etc.).

Reader's Score: 4

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 articulated a place based, child centered strategy for continuum improvement (page 15) that is underway and is based on three key elements: An integrated and aligned high quality service delivery system; Six critical Management capacities; and Four strategic components.

The applicant provides a clear description and graphic of the continuum that incorporates the key elements. The applicant describes four (4) continuum components that include Early Childhood Foundation; Successful Schools and Students; Post-secondary Education and Career Readiness; and Strong Families and Community that covered cradle to career (page 16). The application also highlighted the pivotal role of resident leadership in implementing the program and its sustainability (page 18).

The applicant uses the Complimentary Learning System village-as-campus model, the Dudley Village Campus, which supports student success and places schools at the center of community transformation (page e40). The applicant highlighted its support of the three (3) BPS schools that are persistently underperforming (Level 4) and are using the Turnaround Model for school improvement (page e29 and e240-e245).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 10

Sub Question

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 is using the village-as-campus model that links community supports to the school day and support learning out of school, this strategy seems likely to prevent any gaps in the continuum of solutions (page e40).

The applicant shared in its application a clear narrative of solutions for successful schools and students, post-secondary completion and career readiness, and a strong family and community as being critical components of the continuum (page e39-e48). Solutions at each level were clearly identified for early childhood, primary, secondary, and post-secondary and learning based on the applicant's experience working within the community. Solutions used an evidence-based approach that is highlighted by the applicant in Appendix F. The applicant provided a sound approach to increase students served by the complete continuum and its ability to reach scale over time

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses 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 identified existing community, educational, and social assets on page e54. Also, the applicant provided a more complete program and asset map in Appendix H, Chapter K (e751-e800). These maps and their description clearly indicate how they plan to incorporate the existing assets into their proposed project. For example one map highlights educational assets in the Mayor of Boston's initiative the Circle of Promise that targets improvement in Boston's distressed communities.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses 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's narrative discussed the applicant's approach to achieving annual goals over the next five years that are focused on needs prioritized by the community, opportunities for big impact, opportunities that maximize the use of existing resources, and areas where there is a real window of opportunity for making significant progress (pages e56-e57). Annual goals were clear and the plan for leveraging additional community resources (page e62) was well defined in the application and included

Sub Question

systems improvement. Examples of systems improvement included Early Childhood Foundation: Standard screening tool adopted for 0-3s in BPI; Successful Schools and Students: Schools adopt English Language Proficiency Assessment; and others.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

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 application clearly identified indicators used in the needs assessment and segmentation analysis in its BPI Summary of How Solutions Are Informed By Our Needs on page e64. The Summary provided a strong narrative and visual representation of the applicant's connection of the solutions to the research conducted. The applicant also shared its use of community dialogues, asset inventory and other data efforts to learn about the Dudley neighborhood's foreign-born residents and those speaking a language other than English at home (page e62). The segmentation analysis clearly identified the challenges faced by youth and families in the neighborhood and informed the solutions developed (Appendix F). The applicant identified distinct populations that have different needs based on students and family conditions and there are clear solutions tied to those distinct needs.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses 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:

Solutions presented were based on research and the applicant's previous experience with community, families and students in the Dudley Street neighborhood. Moderate to strong evidence based solutions were used for early childhood foundation, postsecondary education, and strong families and communities efforts (pages e65-e68 and Appendix F). For example, the turnaround plans for school success uses strong evidence of a well established model, informed by research, that has seen success in improving low-performing schools.

Sub Question

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses 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:

Indicators for improvement and annual goals were clearly identified and shared by the applicant on page e69 and goals for each solution were included with greater detail in Appendix F. The applicant established a baseline percentage indicator based on the needs assessment, segmentation analysis and other research conducted. The annual percentage increases for goals in each solution are ambitious, realistic, measurable and attainable targets. A good example shared by the applicant was STEM Pathway which would improve STEM course performance.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses 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 provided a summary of its organizational management capacity and the capacity of the management team (pages 50-52). The ability to break down silos between residents, schools, Boston Public Schools, elected officials and community partners (page 53)) is highlighted as a strength and lesson learned from years of experience in working in the community.

The applicant 's approach and experience in engaging and empowering community residents, both young and old, in that demonstrates its ability to work effectively with the neighborhood and its residents (page 56-57). The applicant also has MOUs with the four schools serving the neighborhood and has a long history of working with the schools through organizing capacity of school principals needed to align partners to their turnaround plans (page 58).

The applicant is the lead neighborhood partner for HUD' s Choice neighborhoods and DOJ 's Defending Childhood grant partner of the Boston Public Health Commission (Page 60). In addition the applicant

Sub Question

regularly works with the Mayor, elected officials, and local and state agencies in implementing programs that benefit the residents of the Dudley neighborhood. (page 60-61).

Pages 62-63 highlights the applicant's experience in working with community organizations. The applicant shows significant capability in working with community residents and is utilizing best practices for resident involvement in the program.

Weaknesses:

No weakness 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 demonstrates previous experience in data collection, analysis and management including. The applicant is implementing a case management, SPSS and longitudinal data system utilizing Efforts to Outcomes (ETO) software (page 64). The applicant has also formed a data team that insures that data is FERPA and HIPAA compliant (page 66). A strategy for data sharing authority was also included that incorporated a privacy policy (page 71).

The applicant proposes to create a BPI annual Report card on the progress made in implementing the program and will use ACT plans for communicating the performance data to the public (page 69-70).

A schematic of the applicant's data system was provided on pages 66-67 that clearly supported the applicant's experience, lessons learned and approach to build capacity.

The Data Team listed on page 65 has significant experience in data management and applications for community programs (Appendix B).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses 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:

Visions, theories of action and theories of change were incorporated into the MOUs established with all project partners (Appendix F). The applicant's board of directors authorized the formation of 3 committees to support the work of the BPI: Strategy Group, Data Team and Accountability Team (page 74). The Accountability Team is responsible for holding partners responsible for performance and making determinations about future allocations of resources based on performance.

Sub Question

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 10

4. 4d. Ability to Integrate Funding Streams

Experience, lessons learned, and proposal to build capacity of the 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 strong experience in this area and mobilizing resources within the community. Choice Neighborhoods program implementation will be leveraged for the program that will address the housing stability challenges in the neighborhood. Also the applicant has established a Funders Group to leverage new resources to compliment the continuum (page 74). Leveraged federal investment in the BPI community was provided on page 75. These actions were based on lessons learned from previous programs.

The applicant substantiated its experience in integrating funding streams from multiple public and private sources (page 76). In addition, the applicant clearly identified high quality programs in the neighborhood that would be integrate and leveraged into the continuum of solutions (page 76).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses 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 has established an early learning network and has participated in the public-private School Readiness Action Planning Team. DSNi has served as Thrive in 5' s hub agency in the Dudley neighborhood and the Dudley Children Thrive School Readiness Roundtable. The Early Learning Network efforts are aligned with the DEEC Race to the Top Early Learning Plan. (Pages 23-27 and Appendix F: Chapter 1).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses 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:

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:

DSNI demonstrates previous and extensive experience in providing quality housing options and solutions for families of all income levels. As Lead Neighborhood Partner in the Choice Neighborhood Implementation Grant, DSNI is well positioned to address issues of housing instability faced by Dudley neighborhood families (pages 30-31, Appendix F, and Appendix H).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found

Reader's Score: 1

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 10/27/2012 12:33 AM