

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 10/29/2012 07:21 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Mission Economic Development Agency (U215N120046)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Need for Project</b>		
1. Selection Criteria 1	15	15
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Selection Criteria 2	25	24
<b>Quality of Project Services</b>		
1. Selection Criteria 3	15	15
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Selection Criteria 4	45	43
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	97
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Comprehensive Local Early Learning Network</b>		
1. CPP 4	2	2
<b>Sub Total</b>	2	2
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Quality Internet Connectivity</b>		
1. CPP 5	1	1
<b>Arts and Humanities</b>		
1. CPP 6	1	0
<b>Quality Affordable Housing</b>		
1. CPP 7	1	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	3	1
<b>Total</b>	105	100

# Technical Review Form

Panel #34 - Implementation Panel - 34: 84.215N

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

Applicant: Mission Economic Development Agency (U215N120046)

## 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 presents complete information for the magnitude of needs of the PN area. Severe needs are presented: high poverty of Latino residents, lack of kindergarten readiness skills prior to entering kindergarten, low student academic achievement, overall lack of economic and academic structures and supports, limited access to health care, children attending low performing schools, and neighborhood violence. (pp. e31-e33) Other needs are clearly presented as "lack of affordable housing, limited job opportunities, language barriers, high percentage of single-parent households and teen births, and victimization by predatory financial services." (p. e28) The applicant successfully links the magnitude of needs to outcomes for this PN population. A strong example is the severe need of lack of affordable housing as there is a need "for individuals and families to work multiple jobs in order to afford rent." (p. e28)

The applicant provides comparison statistics to show the magnitude of each need. Strong examples include the graduation rate at "both John O'Connell and Mission High was 71 percent significantly lower than the District average of 82 percent." (p. e24) Another strong example is presented for the lack of academic achievement specifically in English language arts. California's average for 2010-11 is 56 percent, and the San Francisco Unified School District's average is 56 percent. Concrete examples are evident such as the following PN schools and their ELA proficiency averages are Cesar Chavez ES/29 percent; Bryant ES/32 percent; Everett MS/27 percent; and John O'Connell HS 23 percent. (p. 26) Specific data for each school are presented for percent of students proficient in ELA and math, truancy rates, ELL rates, chronic absenteeism rates, free/reduced lunch rates, rates of students with disabilities, and ethnic backgrounds. (pp. e26-e27) A needs assessment was conducted by the University of California, Berkeley's Center for Latino Policy Research which also completed the segmentation analysis. The applicant then used this needs assessment and segmentation analysis to form the solutions. A complete segmentation analysis was conducted in the assessment, and segmentation analysis includes aspects such as ages, gender, ethnicities, comparison statistics (e.g. PN Mission district and San Francisco), income levels, occupations, and English language proficiencies. (pp. e29-e31)

**Sub Question**

**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:**

The applicant adequately identifies the geographic PN area of the Mission District within San Francisco and provides a detailed map. All schools are clearly identified by location. Other neighborhood assets and MPN Hubs are located on the map and include City College of San Francisco, the Instituto de Familiar de la Raza, Good Samaritan, and Mission Neighborhood Health Center. Strong geographical characteristics are provided such as the PN area's square mileage, exact streets, proximity to major highways, Census tracts, zip codes, Mission area population, ethnicities, and a brief historical perspective of Mission. (pp. e23, e34) The applicant defines the PN Mission district to be a "neighborhood of San Francisco, California" and consists of 1.8 square miles in San Francisco's Southeastern portion. (p. e34)

**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: 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 identifies all its four target schools to be persistently low achieving schools. (p. e22) The applicant fully defines the types of rigorous school improvement strategies being utilized by the four target schools. The Transformation School Reform Model is being implemented at Cesar Chavez Elementary School and John O'Connell High School. The Turnaround School Reform Model is being implemented at Bryant Elementary School and Everett Middle School. (p. e22) The school reform plans are built on the components of a city-wide Full Service Community Schools approach. Rigorous aspects include strategic community partnerships for extended learning, wellness, cultural enrichment, and support for "college-going and career-minded perspectives" in students and families. (p. e43) Strong improvement strategies at Bryant Elementary School and Cesar Chavez Elementary School include replacement of principals with reform leaders, replacement of fifty percent of teaching faculty, professional development to implement a Balanced Literacy Framework, enhanced math curricula and use of math manipulatives, and differentiated instructional approaches. (p. e45) Details of rigorous school reforms at Everett Middle School include replacement of principal with reform leader, implementation of Community School Model, and human and computer-based approaches to

## Sub Question

accelerating learning to assist readers "catch-up and even surpass" their grade level peers. (p. e45) John O'Connell High School's rigorous reforms include replacing the principal with reform leaders, 21st Century learning technologies, and new focus on expository writing across all curricula. (p. e45)

The applicant presents a feasible plan for solutions which align with the rigorous school improvement reforms focusing on Full Service Community Schools. The plan contains a full continuum of solutions to improve the educational results for children and youth. Strong solutions for the early childhood need include aligning with the existing strategies of First 5 San Francisco and SFUSD's programs; providing prenatal medical and parenting support services; and implementing a new Kindergarten Transition Program. (pp. e60, e238, e246, e250, e252) Well-described educational solutions include job-embedded teacher professional development (Professional Learning/Coaching and Communities for Core Academics), increase in capacity and quality of after-school and summer academic tutoring programs, and support of Transformation and Turnaround Models in target schools. (pp. e62-e63, e265, e270, e276, e279, e292) Post-high school solutions are reasonable and include expansion of the College and Career Center and implementation of the Believing the College Dream Program. (pp. e65, e282, e286)

The applicant affirms that the solutions will also be delivered to children and youth who reside in the defined PN area but do not attend the PN target schools. (p. e47) Specific solutions also focus on language translation services, assistive devices, and special needs accommodations. (p. e48)

Strong educational system solutions include enhanced student data and evaluation, communication with messaging and outreach to students and parents, and capacity building system for training of partners to improve internal PN project systems. (p. e50) Policy support solutions are evident such as the state and national policies for providing multi-domain educational screenings and interventions to young children (ages 0-5). (pp. e261-e262) A strong PN education solution which reinforces practices is broadening the amount of PN families utilizing the Raising a Reader program. (pp. e47-e48)

### 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.**

### Strengths:

To a great extent, the applicant presents a complete implementation plan containing solutions for all education program indicators and all indicators for support from the family and community. No time and resource gaps are evident. Solutions for education programs include providing a comprehensive language and literacy program, providing Preschool for All, and providing financial education and access to college savings accounts to high school students to enable greater readiness for college. (pp. e65, e246, e250)

The applicant provides sufficient evidence for the implementation of solutions for all the PN family and community support indicators. Examples of strong solutions include providing early childhood mental health services to families and children (ages 0-5), Harvest of the Month (free vegetables/fruits to PN residents), secure Our School school/community safety approach, Ceasefire Model of Violence Prevention, Sparkpoint Services for personal finance skills, sector-based workforce development model for youth and adults in PN area, and English as Second Language/Civics Education Program. (pp. e255, e305, e309-e310, e319, e329)

An adequate description of the proposal to plan for solutions is described. Following a complete

### Sub Question

assessment of needs, the applicant and community identified gaps in services and programs. (p. e65) Core gaps are identified as lack of college knowledge and awareness beginning at young ages, lack of college preparation and access particular to students in middle and high schools, lack of financing for attendance in college, and gap for postsecondary technical school and college academic success without remediation. (p. e64)

The applicant affirms that all the PN solutions will be available to children with disabilities. Specific agencies such as Support for Families of Children with Disabilities, the Family Service Agency, and the Family Resource Center will provide services. Professional development will be given to partners in order for them to best accommodate children with disabilities to ensure the solutions are "highly accessible to everyone." (p. 10)

For each solution, the applicant provides comprehensive information for the title of the PN solution, targeted PN indicator, official partners supporting solution, solution description, total cost of program for each of the five years, estimated per child cost for each of the five years, estimated number of children to be served segmented by age, source of funding for each of the five years, and strong or moderate evidence. (pp. e238-e345) Some of the solutions also contain complete descriptions of timing of the implementation of the solutions and annual goals for increasing proportion of children served over time. An excellent implementation timeframe is presented for the solution Summer School for 8th - 9th Graders. (p. e277)

A strong example of scaling up of solutions over time is noted for the solution of Universal Access to Broadband and Computers. Beginning in year one, the applicant explains the rate of annual increase of households receiving greater access to the internet, low-cost computers, and Mission District-Wide Broadband Network to be "Year Three - 11 percent; Year Four - 15 percent; and Year Five - 46 percent." (p. e337)

The applicant states a commitment to participate in Communities of Practice with other Promise Neighborhoods grantees nationwide and with grantees in California to share the progress of the neighborhood work. (p. e74)

#### **Weaknesses:**

The applicant's implementation plan for each solution does not always delineate which components will be accomplished during which years. An example is that the implementation of Family Success Coaches solution does not provide a timeline for specific component implementation but implies all components will be started in year one for all resident families. (p. 334) Other examples include solutions: Early Learning Network for Quality Improvement, Pre School for All, Kindergarten Transitions, and College and Career Centers. (pp. 238, e250, e252, e282) Scaling up of all solutions is not always evident. Examples include solutions: Family Success, Early Learning Network for Quality Improvement, Pre School for All, and Promotores Program. (pp. e238, e250, e332, e334)

**Reader's Score: 4**

### **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 adequately identifies existing neighborhood assets and programs which will be utilized in the PN solutions. Evidence is presented for examples of neighborhood assets such as the San Francisco Unified School District (local and state funded) in their PN efforts for increasing student achievement and the San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing (local funding. (p. e69) Other assets are well-described such as SparkPoint Centers (funded by private funds of United Way of Bay Area), Bridge to Success (funded by Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation private funds), ExCEL After School Program (Federally funded through 21st Century Community Learning Center Grant), PreSchool for All (state funded via Proposition H), Race to the Top Early Learning Challenge (state-wide grants via Federal funds), and Healthy San Francisco (city funded). (pp. e70-e71)

## Sub Question

Numerous partners serve as neighborhood assets in the implementation of solutions. A good example is the Bridge to Success program which is privately funded and implemented by local and state supported assets of the City of San Francisco, San Francisco Unified School District, City College of San Francisco, and San Francisco State University. (p. e70)

### Weaknesses:

No weaknesses are 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 adequately describes annual goals for the improving of systems which impact PN children. The applicant states adequate goals for systems changes for each of the five project years. Evidence of goals for changing systems for policies include "developing a set of family retention policies to ensure that families with children of all income levels have the option to remain in San Francisco" (Goal in Year 3) and "develop SFUSD policies to ensure that decisions on academic achievement are fully needs-based and mindful of family support service needs." (Goal in Year 2) (p. e72) The applicant presents adequate goals for effective systems changes for organizations. Strong examples include the development of a system of service integration among MPN partners which includes shared marketing and outreach, data evaluation, and day-to-day coordination to ensure that there is a seamless continuum of academic achievement and family support efforts." (p. e72)

Within the described goals, the applicant does identify policies and regulations by entity and by level of government (local, school, state) that might impede its progress in implementing the PN project and goals. An example is the identification of a need for a City of San Francisco policy which would "establish thresholds for reinvestment by technology companies" located in San Francisco to "enhance academic achievement and family economic success." (p. e73) One environmental system change goal is presented, and it relates to ensuring children's food served at school is "locally grown, healthy, and cooked from scratch." (p. e73) The applicant presents some information for the leveraging of resources. The goals are presented with measurable components such as in Year 2, "net new MPN dollars from private sources increase by 7 percent of total annual project budget; public sources by 10 percent of total annual project budget; in-kind capacity by 12 percent of total annual budget." (p. e73)

### Weaknesses:

No weaknesses are noted.

**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:**

The applicant adequately describes the needs assessment which involves MEDA administering a survey to 51 non-profit organizations that serve Mission residents to guide the planning work. (p. e33) The University of California at Berkeley's Center for Latino Policy Research completed the needs assessment and segmentation analysis. Twenty data sources were used including strong sources of Census data, aggregate and individual student level data from SFUSD, program participant data from community partners, and a classroom administered survey at each of the four PN target schools. (pp. e74-e75) Specific assessments included data from the Brigance Screen II, school readiness and preschool attendance data from Applied Survey Research, SFUSD's 10th grade early college assessment, the California Department of Education's database information for number of students entering and exiting schools, and key learning and health related indicators from the California Healthy Kids Survey. (pp. e75-e78) A thorough description is given for the segmentation analysis. The segmentation analysis was conducted for analysis of groups such as by age, Mission children, ethnicity, students by grade levels, by PN indicators, and by school. (pp. e79-e80) Details are evident of the use of the segmentation analysis in formulating solutions. The applicant thoroughly describes the segmentation analysis by PN indicator and then what solution was determined to address the defined need. An example is the segmentation analysis showing 61 percent of students in the MPN target schools who prepared to enter middle school were not demonstrating the "necessary academic proficiency for future success" and "1 in 4 of all 4th and 5th graders lacked internet access at home." Solutions then are focused on "providing additional academic and social support to transition students into the middle school." (pp. e79-e80) All education indicators and family/community support indicators are described for the assessment and segmentation analysis processes.

**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:**

The applicant presents thorough and comprehensive evidence for each PN solution. The PN evidence was researched and prepared by an experienced researcher, and her team then presented the evidence to the overall PN Planning Project Team. The center of the project, school reform and increase in academic performance, is based on a "body of evidence" including the Bryk Model for School Reform from Organizing Schools for Reform: Lessons from Chicago. (p. e82)

Examples of strong evidence are noted for the solution Centering Pregnancy Program which has strong evidence from K.A. Baldwin's research Comparison of Selected Outcomes of Centering Pregnancy Versus Traditional Prenatal Care as published in Journal of Midwifery and Children's Health, and research from the Centering Healthcare Institute Research and Evaluation on the Centering Model of Care (2009-2011). (p. e352) The applicant details the researcher(s), date(s) of studies, and synopsis of findings for each piece of evidence.

Examples of moderate evidence supporting solutions is noted for the school turnaround and transformation model solutions which are built upon moderate evidence from Leithwood's research How Leadership Influences Student Learning published by the Center for Applied Research and Educational Improvement in 2004. (p. e354)

### Sub Question

Researchers are identified and include Epstein (school/family connections solutions), Primavera (technology access for low-income preschoolers), Pena (parent involvement), Durlack (after school programs to increase personal social skills in children and adolescents), and Birman (designing professional development that works). (pp. e346-e363)

#### **Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses are 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:**

Clear annual goals for improvement for most of the education and family/community support indicators are presented. Current baseline data are presented, and plans are described for collecting indicator data on a quarterly basis beginning in 2013 and continuing through 2017. (p. e84) The applicant adequately describes the process for development of the goals. The goals are based on the universe of solutions addressing each indicator, number of families and children served by each solution, and expected progress over time with time for scaling-up of solutions. (p. e83) An example of a strong goal is for the indicator for family/community support for learning. The applicant selects assessment of that indicator to be percentage of families that read to children and encourage reading. Current baseline percentage is 63 percent. Goals and percentages of increase are year one/65 percent, year two/70 percent, year three/75 percent, year four/82 percent, and year five/91 percent. (p. e84)

#### **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:** 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.**

## Sub Question

### Strengths:

The applicant adequately details the PN governance system to contain three governing bodies: Mission Economic Development Board, Community Board, and Mission Promise Neighborhood Board. Strength in Board formation is evident with the Mission Economic Development Board being comprised of one-third residents of the proposed PN geographic area. (p. e87) This Board "will serve as the final decision-making authority" on recommendations from the PN Advisory Board and Community Board. (p. e87)

Promise Neighborhood Management Team members are detailed by position title and include Executive Director, Project Director (TBD), Director of Systems, Director of Programs, Director of Evaluation, Director of Communications, and Leadership Academy Director. (p. e87) The position of PN Project Director has a strong job description and criteria for qualifications. (pp. e129-e130) The applicant does present brief listings of job responsibilities for the Promise Neighborhood personnel positions. (Budget Narrative, p. e460) The applicant documents its commitment to share data and evaluation results with the PN national evaluator. (pp. e50, e102)

Comprehensive information is presented for the management team's experiences with the neighborhood, residents, and schools. The MPN Executive Director has fifteen years' experience working "in the Mission District and with its residents" on projects such as the redevelopment of Plaza Adelante, a one stop asset development center. He also has direct experience in Federal grant management such as grants from HUD and the Department of Education. (p. e91) Experiences with the neighborhood residents include providing programs for free tax preparation, workforce development, homeownership counseling, and technology training. (p. e89) Specific experience in working with the neighborhood is also stated to be that "from 2006-2011, MEDA created 207 new businesses that netted over 450 new jobs for the community." (p. e89) Key experiences of the management team members working with the LEA (schools) focuses on activities of a key leader in the SFUSD who also serves on the PN Management Team and leads the Mission School District's school reform process. (pp. e87, e90, e91) The Management Team has vast experience collaborating with local service providers such as the United Way of Bay Area to create San Francisco SparkPoint Center and the Jamestown Community Center to create youth programs. (pp. e89, e95) Experiences are also detailed for the Management Team's work with local Mayor of San Francisco. (pp. e92, e108) The applicant presents experience with Federal government officials including organizing Congressional briefings for a Closing the Racial Wealth Gap Initiative. (p. e94) Documentation is provided of some collaboration between the PN staff and Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi and U.S. Senator Barbara Boxer for this Promise Neighborhoods Grant. (pp. e432, e433, e436)

Lessons learned are detailed for ones with PN residents, the LEA, and the schools as the management team learned lessons during the SIG initiative in the schools and during work with the residents as the team learned the critical nature of offering services in Spanish (or other languages where appropriate) in "a culturally responsive way." (p. e95) A key lesson learned with service providers was the "need to create strong cross-sector partnerships to be successful." (p. e96)

A proposal to build capacity with residents and service providers is evident with a proposal to assist organizations in offering language translations. (p. e95) Another strong example is the inclusion of community leaders on the management team such as from the Mayor's Office, SFUSD, Good Samaritan Family Resource Center, and Jamestown Community Center. (p. e87)

### Weaknesses:

The applicant does not present strong specific lessons learned and proposals to build capacity in working with state and Federal governmental leaders. The applicant states that the management team "has a history of working closely with government leaders in San Francisco, and at the Federal and state levels," but specific lessons learned and proposals to build capacity with state and Federal leaders are missing. (pp. e95-e96) The applicant gives documentation of lessons learned in a general fashion and not a specific manner. An example is "CBOs, government agencies and the School District must all be on the same page with a shared vision for moving forward." (p. e96)

**Reader's Score: 9**

## Sub Question

### 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 provides some experiences of the management team in collecting, analyzing, and using data in decision-making. A strong description of experiences with project data includes MEDA "designing its own longitudinal data base and outcome tracking system," utilizing Efforts to Outcomes to create a shared data tracking system with SparkPoint partners, collecting/analyzing data for over "5,500 individuals each year, reporting to "seven Federal funding streams from six different Federal agencies" such as HUD, and conducting integrated (SFUSD, DCYF, CCSF) longitudinal analyses for a HUD program. (pp. e98-e99) Experience is also noted for the management's use of data in decision-making, learning, continuous improvement, and accountability with the Bridge to Success Initiative. (p. e99)

The PN Management Team contains several individuals with experience in using data in project development, implementation, and evaluation. The applicant presents an overview of strong research skills of the proposed research and evaluation partner for the PN project from the John W. Gardner Center for Youth and Their Communities at Stanford University. (pp. e96, e99) Specific research design, analyses, and public policy planning experiences of the management team are detailed. (p. e99) An adequate plan is presented for building and expanding a longitudinal data system. The applicant's plan includes strong aspects such as specific research questions, quantitative and qualitative analysis methods, and numerous data sources which will be integrated (e.g. SFUSD, First 5, and service providers) (p. e100) A comprehensive evaluation for continuous improvement is presented with components of input program data into ETO database, transfer data to John W. Gardner Center who is conducting analyses, link data to MPN families and Youth Data Archive, analyze results, present/discuss findings, and make program improvements. (pp. e98, e100) A brief statement is made that the Gardner Center will "secure human subjects approval through the Standard University Institutional Review Board for all data collections related to this implementation grant." (p. e100) A comprehensive PN Communications Plan contains elements for the distribution of data analyses, results, and PN progress to parents, families, residents, partners, researchers, and evaluators. (p. e443)

Lessons learned are well-described and include the applicant discovering "tension between 'innovation' and 'evidence based' community program definitions and also learned that data sharing systems required a significant management staff and systems capacity for implementation. (p. e104) The applicant adequately addresses the proposal to build capacity and accountability by the management team and director. The primary capacity building will occur in investing in "significant resources" in PN evaluation for partner agencies and for the MEDA to ensure that all agencies and entities have the systems, infrastructure, and human resources to effectively track and evaluate data for all indicators. (p. 104) Rapid-time data collection, analysis, and use are addressed by the applicant. (pp. e98-e99)

#### **Weaknesses:**

The applicant does not include clear plans to integrate data from multiple sources in a manner which abides by privacy laws and requirements. Documentation is not evident that the applicant will abide by local, state, Federal guidelines and laws including HIPAA, in the integration of data from partners such as local schools, state data, health related data, data from health care, and partner agencies. (pp. e96-e100) The applicant states it has Data Use Agreements with several agencies, the SFUSD (school district), the City College of San Francisco, and the Department of Children, Youth, and Their Families, but no other specifics are given as to the type of adherence to local, state, and Federal guidelines. No medical provider agreements or adherence to HIPAA are mentioned or documented in the narrative or appendix. (p. e99)

**Reader's Score: 14**

## Sub Question

### 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 presents the Management Team's experiences and lessons learned in creating formal and informal partnerships. Formal partnerships include the MEDA and United Way of Bay Area creating the ten SparkPoint Centers throughout the Bay Area. Another formal partnership experience is adequately presented as the City of San Francisco collaborating with MEDA and other agencies to implement the Preschool for All Initiative to establish free half-day preschool for all four-year-olds in San Francisco. (p. e70) Other partnership experiences are the Community Schools Model in the SFUSD, the Latino Tech Net, and the MPN planning process which involved "55 organizations and over 200 stakeholders." (p. e105) The applicant presents three strong lessons learned including successful partnerships will occur when a need is established to be met and partners are committed to a shared "mission and vision" and effective partnerships need to have buy-in from multiple levels of staff in order to be beneficial. (p. e106) The management team's proposal to build capacity is documented. One example of a strong proposal is to create formal written agreements (MOUs, work plans, budgets) that are clear and express mutual commitments and responsibilities. (p. e106) Another proposal to build capacity is to have a system of coordination to develop relationships with partners' staff at multiple levels, especially with the school district and other partner organizations. (p. e106)

The applicant provides an adequate MOU which affirms the Promise Neighborhood's vision, mission, theory of change, and theory of action. (pp. e215-e217) Strong aspects of the MOU include the provision of Mission Economic Development Agency serving as lead agency, fiscal agent, and primary project manager; PN governance structure; responsibilities of the Mission Economic Development Agency Board of Directors for PN legal, fiscal, and fiduciary matters; and composition of Mission Promise Neighborhood Advisory Institutional Advisory Board and Mission Promise Neighborhood Advisory Board. (pp. e214-e219) All partners present their organization's visions and theories of action/change which adequately align to the vision and theories of action/change of this PN project. (pp. e219-e230, e346-e351) Specific strong measures are described for the project's accountability. Accountability processes are detailed for the both the Mission Economic Development Agency (lead partner and PN fiscal agent) and for the Mission Promise Neighborhood project partners. Numerous components are evident such as "MEDA will monitor contract compliance" and "in the event a partner agency or contractor consistently fails to meet deliverables, MEDA will retain the right to cancel the contract and identify a new contractor to complete the proposed work." (p. e107)

#### **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 adequately presents experiences of the management team in integrating resources from public and private resources. A strong example is the management team integrating resources from the Department of Education, National Telecommunications and Information Administration, Small Business Administration, Department of Housing and Urban Development and Community Development Financial Institutions Fund and Administration for Children and Families for "collaborative work benefiting the

**Sub Question**

Mission District." (p. e108) Another strong experience is the leveraging of public funding from the City of San Francisco, CDBG, private banks, and private foundations for the completion of the Plaza Adelante development project. (pp. e108-e109) Lessons learned are adequately detailed and include learning that collaborative fundraising required "dedicated leadership, transparent communication, and significant fundraising capacity." (p. e109) The applicant cites a proposal to build capacity by maintaining strong relationships with "financial institutions, corporations, foundations, and private sector funders" in order to sustain the Mission Promise Neighborhood project "beyond the five years." (p. e109) Multiple public and private funding streams are documented including the public sources: the City of San Francisco and the San Francisco Unified School District and private sources: Bank of America, Comerica Bank, Citibank, Kresge Foundation, California Emerging Technologies Fund, and the San Francisco Foundation. (p. e109)

**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 provides details of a quality early childhood learning network which is to be funded by DCYF, First 5, and the Human Services Agency. (p. e111) A highly qualified and credentialed individual is identified as the Early Learning and Development Project Area Coordinator, and she currently holds a California Child Development Program Director Permit. (pp. e113, e163) Strong components of the early learning program for children age birth through grade three include parent training and engagement, alignment to California's Common Core Curriculum, inclusion of multiple sources of early child providers (Early Head Start, Head Start, home-based, family-based, and center-based), emphasis on Quality Rating Improvement System, promotion of children's health, and professional and workforce development for providers "specific to needs of the Latino, low-income, and primarily immigrant community." (pp. e112-e113) Other key measures include the integration of data systems of First 5, DCYF, and H.S.A. which will link through the Cocoa system. (p. e113) Needs assessment specific to the young children was addressed. The assessment findings point toward a high number of young children participating in pre-school experiences, but "95 percent of the MPN children are not Kindergarten ready." (p. e113) A brief governance structure is presented, and some detail is given for the MPN's Early Learning and Development PAC being responsible to develop a strategic plan and goals for quality improvement. (p. e112) The applicant does address children with disabilities. It states that "all solutions within our continuum are accessible and available to children, youth and adults with disabilities." (p. e10)

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses are 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:**

The applicant adequately describes the needs assessment for the quality of technology connectivity of the targeted area. Needs are identified as the need to increase access of "low-cost internet programs" and "free connectivity strategies" especially for the PN low income Latino families. (p. e114) Sufficient strategies are addressed for increasing the students' access to technology skills training, increasing free community broadband network for use at school and at home, and implementing technology applications to support students' schoolwork. Strong solutions include PN district Community Broadband Network; Comcast Internet Essentials and AT&T Connect to Compete Program; low cost refurbished computers; vouchers toward computer costs via technology course completion; school district online portal access for teachers and parents; teacher professional development in School Loop, School Loop Mobile App, and Streetside Stories Technology Coaching Model; basic digital literacy training for parents/families at Plaza Adelante computer labs; and a technology-based internship for youth. (pp. e115-e116) The applicant presents plans to have 100 percent of PN children/youth having internet access at school and at home by the end of the five-year PN project. (p. e84)

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses are noted.

**Reader's Score: 1**

**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 Scored

**Weaknesses:**

Not Scored

**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:**

Not Scored

**Weaknesses:**

Not Scored

**Reader's Score: 0**

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 10/29/2012 07:21 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 10/31/2012 08:50 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Mission Economic Development Agency (U215N120046)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Need for Project</b>		
1. Selection Criteria 1	15	15
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Selection Criteria 2	25	23
<b>Quality of Project Services</b>		
1. Selection Criteria 3	15	15
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Selection Criteria 4	45	44
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	97
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Comprehensive Local Early Learning Network</b>		
1. CPP 4	2	2
<b>Sub Total</b>	2	2
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Quality Internet Connectivity</b>		
1. CPP 5	1	1
<b>Arts and Humanities</b>		
1. CPP 6	1	
<b>Quality Affordable Housing</b>		
1. CPP 7	1	
<b>Sub Total</b>	3	1
<b>Total</b>	105	100

# Technical Review Form

Panel #34 - Implementation Panel - 34: 84.215N

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

Applicant: Mission Economic Development Agency (U215N120046)

## 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 MPN has engaged in an extensive 8 month planning process to gather both rich qualitative and quantitative data about the specific needs of the children and families living in the Mission. They have engaged over 51 organizations as well as invested parent groups in the initial data gathering process. Needs include linguistic isolation, high housing costs, low living wages, attendance at consistently under-performing schools despite SFUSD's fairly high achievement rate, data that the Latino children living in the Mission are not making progress as they move through the school system, teen pregnancy rate, health statistics, and crime (pages e24-e35). The applicant provides detailed city comparison statistics outlining how the children in the Mission District are doing compared to their counterparts in other parts of San Francisco.

A detailed segmentation analysis and needs assessment was completed during the planning year and the data gathered from this extensive process significantly impacted the decision to focus on this particular zone.

#### Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 10

##### 2. 1b. Geographic Area Description

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

#### Strengths:

The applicant addresses the criteria to the full extent by providing 3 different types of maps including census tracts, zip codes, neighborhood street boundaries, square mileage (1.8 miles) and also includes MPN hubs as well as school sites (e34). The lead agency includes population statistics, ethnicities, and also a historical context of the Mission which provides a rich geographic narrative of the proposed Promise Neighborhood.

**Sub Question**

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses 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: 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:**

All schools within the geographic area are either Turnaround or part of a Transformational model as outlined by the AP1 of the federal register. They have worked seamlessly within the framework of SFUSD the community school and SIG reform model. The MPN has aligned their goals with four Mission District goals (page e44) and have collaborated with principals, community school coordinators and other high level SFUSD personnel to design their project. They have made a significant effort to fill in the gaps that the SIG grant did not which completes a true cradle to career continuum for the children living in the district.

They have engaged in a Collective Impact Model (e46) that includes not only encourages multiple organizations to have one agenda but also supports agencies in collaborating effectively to have a collective impact without duplicating services. This model is at the heart of the PN premise. By meeting the economic needs of the community as part of their solutions, the applicant is truly committing to provide a discreet continuum of services to the families and children living in the Mission. By limiting economic stressors and providing for family capacity building, the applicant is decreasing factors of poverty that contribute to low academic performance. This type of deep root cause analysis of the neighborhood will lead to richer and more sustainable solutions.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses 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.**

## Sub Question

### Strengths:

MPN addresses the issue of scaling up to other schools and neighborhoods (such as Bayview and Chinatown) in San Francisco that face similar economic and academic situations. Pages e58-e67 outline proposed PreK-college solutions that supplement the current work of the SFUSD SIG grant and other projects including early learning development, student academic achievement and school improvement, college and career options, Family Economic Success, and safe neighborhoods. Each indicator includes a series of solutions and organized in tables and narratives detailing the gap analysis. Each solution addresses one of the need gaps determined through the community surveys and work during the planning year. They have designed a working partnership with the Community School Coordinator which will provide for sustained family relationships and a conduit for local information about outside services as well as academics. MPNs innovative HUB idea supports a locale for residents and students to access services and support in their home community.

### Weaknesses:

More information is needed about how each one of these solutions will be scaled up to meet the greater need of the Mission district and San Francisco as a whole. Limited information is provided as written as to how to scale up to other schools in the Mission and potentially other neighborhoods such as Bayview.

On page e61, the applicant notes a series of job embedded professional development and coaching strategies for the teachers in the MPN schools including Results Oriented Cycles of Inquiry, Coaching Cycles, Instructional rounds, CA Common Core State Standards, Common Planning Time, and Professional Learning Communities. It is not clear what particular teacher development strategies are the most useful in this context and how they PN team plans on fully implementing this solution for long term impact on instructional practices.

Appendix F notes the inclusion of Family Success Coaches yet indicate how specific families will be identified and contacted (outreach).

**Reader's Score:** 4

### 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 five major community organizations partners that are supported by both federal, state, and local funds including SparkPoint Centers (Family Economic Success), Bridge to Success (college readiness and retention), ExCEL After School Programs (Safe communities and increased student achievement), Preschool for All/Race to the Top EL Challenge (pre-school), and Healthy San Francisco (healthcare options for low income and uninsured residents). All of these partners connect to one of the major indicators and solutions outlined by the MPN team as project goals (e69-e71) .

#### Weaknesses:

Although the applicant has included a plethora of major players as community assets, one of their key tenants is including and building capacity at the neighborhood level. More collaboration between neighborhood businesses and smaller community organizations could strengthen this section as the project would be building true local economic capacity of the immediate neighborhood which subsequently could impact residents ability to secure jobs and contribute to the financial development of the Mission.

More complete information about the role of the Mayor s office and the financial stability of the community and the role of the Sparkpoint Center would augment this section of the proposal.

**Sub Question**

**Reader's Score:** 4

**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:**

Pages e71-e74 outline MPNs strategic implementation plan for improving systems during each year of the grant cycle as well as information about how they will sustain the project financially after the five year cycle. Annual financial goals are measurable and included manageable benchmarks which indicate how MPN will effectively scale up and sustain MPN.

With the state and local government support of MPN as noted in the MOU's and letters of support, it is likely that the annual systemic goals will be met.

**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 applicant addressed all of the PN indicators as outlined in the RFP. Their extensive data collection and outcome evidence drove the solutions for their project as noted on pages e78-e83. They included 20 data sources and gathered qualitative and quantitative information from over 20 sources including 50 non-profits, program participants, and school staff. Academic data included the Brigance, attendance data, early learning opportunities, attendance data, college readiness, high school graduation rate, safety, health data, academic proficiency gaps in core subject areas, as well as family economic stability ((pages e75-e78). The applicant subsequently the notes the complexity of the data story and how it reveals the complicated lives that many students and families live on a daily basis. A major strength of this section is the depth at which they look at their data, analyze it and confer with partners and participants in order to truly understand all of the cause indicators impacting economic, family, community and academic stability.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses found.

**Sub Question**

**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 provides a rich story of how their extensive quantitative and qualitative data sets have been used to determine community needs/indicators and subsequent outcomes. They indexed all of the information to create critical junctures in which determine the most pressing needs (page e78). Table C2 on page e82 outlines and analyzes the evidence presented as does the extensive bibliography. Each indicator has been dissected into specific programming priorities and explained in themed tables (pages e352 e363) with the strength of the evidence indicators included in the both the narrative and tables. The University of California at Berkeley supported the completion of the literature review for the project and subsequent solutions. (e74)

**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:**

The MPN provides a detailed analysis of their baseline and annual goals on page e84 including percentages for scaling up over the five period. They indicate an improvement jump in years 3-5 which make logical sense in relationship to implementation training and possible dips depending on the circumstances.

Appendix F 236-e380) includes six chapters of dedicated to describing each solution (Early Learning and Development, Student Achievement and School Improvement, Strong and Safe Neighborhoods, Family Economic Success, Universal Services, and Tech for Success) with clarity and details about funding sources, students served, partners, source and quality of evidence, and segmentation source as well as analysis. Not only has MPN described a "general" solution (Early Learning and Development), they have also disaggregated each solution into manageable parts to address the needs of all families and students being served within that particular continuum.

**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: 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:**

MPN does an excellent job of describing their relationships with the community at large as well as CBO's in their management section. The management team consists of multiple civic players including highly qualified MEDA staff, the Deputy Superintendent of SFUSD, the Mayor's Advisor on Education, directors of various community centers, and the SFUSD Director of Family and Community Engagement (p.e.87). MEDA believes in asset development of families and have moved from an organization serving 73 families to over 5,500 in 15 years. MEDA is also the main developer of Plaza Adelante (one of the MPN HUB's) and a key stakeholder in bringing a SparkPoint Center (Annie E. Casey Foundation) to San Francisco.

The applicant describes 4 summarized lessons learned on pages e95-e96 and includes a compelling capacity building project called the Mission Promise Leadership Academy

The applicant sets a strong stage outlining their numerous partnerships, histories, and shared vision for Mission families including 'envision[ing] generations of Latino families that are a part of vibrant, diverse, proud and forward thinking communities in which residents own their own homes and businesses, and are actively engaged in the civic life of their neighborhoods and the institutions that affect their lives. We see these families as having sufficient assets to provide them and future generations with the opportunity to call San Francisco their permanent home" (p. e88).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses 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:**

Pages e96-e104 describe the lead agency's data management plan as well as the role of key stakeholders in building capacity around making collected data applicable and actionable. The applicant has outlined two agencies and described their roles in developing a complex data sharing system that also is user-friendly and practical. Partnerships include the John W Gardner Center for Youth and Their Communities (JGC), SparkPoint and the utilization of Efforts to Outcomes (ETO) and the MEDA Executive Director's experience tracking data for multiple federal and state programs including HUD and SFUSD (pages e97-98).

One of JGC's major initiatives is the Youd Data Archive (YDA) that connects partners in order to data share in rapid-time. YDA generates longitudinal data that can be used quickly by multiple stakeholders and has strong relationships with many community partners that will benefit the long-term success of the MPN.

The applicant includes lessons learned (e103-e104) and a plan to address the needs of partners who may not have as much experience working with large amounts of data and how to segment what they need to improve their specific task within the scope of the project (e101).

## Sub Question

There are two unique additions to this proposal; MPN's suggested evaluation plan that includes critical action research questions about the impact of the project (e101) and also an understanding that some "evidence-based" practices may not be as culturally relevant because of a lack of research (e104) . They include promising practices based on the cultural nuances of the neighborhood and population and hope to "elevate these [promising]practices" to evidence based outcomes using the rich data collection provided and used by MPN partners.

### **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:**

MPN and their management team has experience in collaborating with a variety of key stakeholders including universities, SFUSD, national organizations such as the Annie E. Casey Foundation, local government, local CBO's, and federal agencies including Promise Neighborhoods. They have successfully defined the idea of "effective partnerships" in their MOU and designed an accountability system for each MPN goal including transparency, fiscal responsibility, successful delivery of services, and progress monitoring of intended solutions to ensure their continued validity (page e107). A critical element of the MPN governance structure is the Community Board which includes student, parents, and other resident representation (e.108).

The MOU is extensive as are the numerous and diverse collection of letters of support. A key notion in lessons learned is the idea that all partnering organizations must not only have mutual accountability but also gain mutual benefits; this sort of reciprocity not only builds solid relationships, but also creates a lasting commitment to the project itself (e106).

### **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 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:**

As written, MPN has secured [REDACTED] in public and private in cash and in kind resources to supplement a PN implementation grant for the five year cycle. Financial partners include private foundations such as the Kresge foundation as well as major corporate leaders such as Charles Schwab (e109). The applicant has leveraged not only programming partners with each proposed program area/goal but also financial partners connected to each goal on page e111.

The lead agency has successfully applied for and managed funding from six federal agencies totaling

**Sub Question**

more than [REDACTED] dollars in the last three years.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant did not expressly note the challenges they have encountered working with so many types of financial organizations and or the lessons learned; under this section on page e109, MPN describes their aggressive goals and the interest of other partners, but does not include specific ideas about how they might overcome future challenges working with multiple financial agencies who also have their own goals and agendas.

**Reader's Score: 9**

**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 uses segmentation data to determine specific needs of their Early Learning families; they note that their biggest area of challenge is in the birth -3 year old domain and have subsequently designed a program that works with both center-based and home-based opportunities. The plan includes working with SFUSD and their RTT consortia as well as with the RTT QRIS and aligning the Common Core curriculum to pre-school outcomes (e111-e114).

Their data analysis also indicates that although a significant number of children in the Mission attend some sort of pre-school, approximately 95% of them are not considered "kindergarten ready" when they arrive at traditional public school.

By strengthening their Early Learning partners and providing specific ECE professional development, the project is truly building a cradle to career continuum of services for families.

**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:**

Not only has MPN described the economic impact of not being 'connected' in one of the world's most technologically savvy regions, but also how they plan on closing the digital gap. Once again, the applicant digs deeper than just "providing internet services" and discusses the long-term ramifications of connecting families to technology to support academics (both as receiving information about students' progress and helping children access homework and do research) and build necessary job 21st skills that can be applied to employment and other economic opportunities.

Their plan includes community broadband internet access, low-cost home internet, computers, and tech training.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score:** 1

**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:**

**Weaknesses:**

**Reader's Score:**

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 10/31/2012 08:50 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 10/29/2012 04:36 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Mission Economic Development Agency (U215N120046)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Need for Project</b>		
1. Selection Criteria 1	15	15
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Selection Criteria 2	25	25
<b>Quality of Project Services</b>		
1. Selection Criteria 3	15	15
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Selection Criteria 4	45	45
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	100
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Comprehensive Local Early Learning Network</b>		
1. CPP 4	2	2
<b>Sub Total</b>	2	2
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Quality Internet Connectivity</b>		
1. CPP 5	1	1
<b>Arts and Humanities</b>		
1. CPP 6	1	
<b>Quality Affordable Housing</b>		
1. CPP 7	1	
<b>Sub Total</b>	3	1
<b>Total</b>	105	103

# Technical Review Form

Panel #34 - Implementation Panel - 34: 84.215N

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

Applicant: Mission Economic Development Agency (U215N120046)

## 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:**

As with the entire proposal the Mission Promise Neighborhood (MPN) lays out great amount of detail and rational. Seven of the districts ten lowest performing schools are within the Mission District (page 5/e24). All four schools targeted for Phase I of the project are Persistently Lowest-Achieving as indicated in Table A.1 (page 3/e22). Of the two high schools, John O Connell High School and Mission High School both are considered Persistently Lowest-Achieving (page 5/e24) with the former targeted for Phase I and the Latter targeted for Phase II.

Among the education challenges both high schools have a graduation rate of 71 percent which is significantly lower than the district average of 82 percent (page 5/e24), there is chronic absenteeism in the kindergarten, grade schools and middle schools as well as the high schools (page 6/e25), and there are higher levels of learning disabilities and higher proportion of low income students. The narrative includes a student snapshot by school and category based on California Department Education Data. (page 7/e26) The use of comparison data between the project area and the surrounding area and city strengthens the description.

An examination of family and community environmental factors demonstrate need: high obesity rate in children, a low immunization rate, the neighborhood has the third highest rate of youth involvement in the juvenile justice system, and due to the high cost of housing in the city, much of the available housing within the district is not affordable. All of this information as well as indicators on teen birth rates, poverty, language barriers, employment and financial stability are well documented in Tables A.2 through Table A.9. (page 10-12/e29-31)

#### **Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 10

**Sub Question**

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

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

**Strengths:**

The description of the proposed Promise Neighborhood is accurately and fully described. The proposed area is the Mission District neighborhood in the City of San Francisco. The Mission district is an area of approximately 1.8 square miles in the City's Southeastern portion with street boundaries of 11th Street to the north, Caesar Chavez Street to the south, Route 101 to the east and Dolores Street to the west. (page 15/e34) A map describes the geographic location of the neighborhood in relation to the rest of the area and city and indicates where the schools are within the neighborhood (page 15/e34). In addition, appendix G (page 8 of appendix/e 388) includes additional charts that detail the makeup of the PN and the location of schools within the area of the description.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses 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: 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 proposal included an extensive effort at consultation and planning that included a project team, working groups and a data/research team. As part of the planning process the lead applicant (MEAD) joined with the school district and the Mayor's Office. In addition, over 200 stakeholders representing 55 community-based governments, philanthropic, intermediary and private sector organizations, were joined by parents, students and other community members in an intensive planning process over an eight month period. (page 16/ewe)

In order to create equitable education opportunities the school district is engaged in a sweeping reform and redesign process that is built on a vision of city-wide full service community schools by promoting student academic achievement by supporting the whole child, meaningful family and community engagement and high quality innovative teachers and school leadership. The Mission Promise Neighborhood (MPH) is an opportunity to fully achieve that vision by integrating currently disconnected and unfocused resources into an exemplary neighborhood model (page 23/ewe). The MPH complements and support reform models currently being implemented and is designed to fill in gaps with the turnaround model in the Everett Middle School and the Bryan Elementary School and the transformation models for the Caesar Achieve elementary school and the O Connell High School. (pages 23-26/ewe-45) It builds on current education reform efforts and plans on addressing a range of economic and social factors that can have an impact on the child.

## Sub Question

### Weaknesses:

No weaknesses 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 design includes a phase-in of services and describes the initial target populations. To start the MPN, it will include students at two of the elementary schools, the middle school, and one of the high schools and all families with children zero through five living within the Mission district. By year three the MPN will reach the entire target population. As part of the phase-in, in Phase I students attending two of the grade schools, a middle school and a high school will be assisted. The target population includes 2000 children and youth. By year three of the proposal they expect to reach 100 percent of the target population but the plan also envisions reaching beyond the target population and includes families and children outside of the defined target population (page 28/e47)

The proposal also lays out a strategy to integrate services and systems including data collection, communications and building capacity of services. The plan also describes needs and gaps. In these instances they have already identified the needs and the gaps and how they will be addressed including which programs and sources they are ready to leverage. For example Early Learning and Development. (page 39/e58). In this area they have identified gaps in regard to services to the 0 to three population, parent engagement and program quality standards. In response they will leverage and integrate Preschool for All, Race to the Top-Early Learning, Head Start, Healthy San Francisco, and California Healthy Families, funding and programs in existence. (page 40/e59)

The plan describes Cradle-to-College-to-Career Continuum Overview with a chart (page 29-30/e48-49) that will support student academic success and family economic success with the support of shared and integrated systems, universal services and evidence-based solutions. (page 9/e48)

The proposal is especially strong on innovations such as a network of hubs where services will be accessed by families (page 32/e51). Community school coordinators at target schools will ensure key services are provided, including (page 34/e53) family success coaches for all target families. (page 34/e53)

### 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 proposal is especially strong in this area by including review of current assets, where the gaps are, what resources are available and how they will be leveraged. All three levels of government are engaged and service providers and private entities are part of the plan.

## Sub Question

Specific to this point, the proposal evaluates the needs and gaps (for example Early Learning on Page 39/e58, describes limits in services for zero to three, a lack of parent engagement and a need for program quality standards. They then discuss what funding and resources they will leverage such as Head Start, Race to the Top funding, and Healthy San Francisco and California Healthy Family resources. (page 40/e59) After the applicant identifies the funding and resources they will leverage, the applicant will conclude their assessment of the gaps and describe how and where it will access funds for each of the areas. This includes Student Achievement/School Improvement (page 42/e61), College and Career (page 44/e63), Family Economic Success (page 46/e65), Strong and Safe Neighborhoods, (page 48/e67) and Technology (described in a later part).

### **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:**

In addition to the information included in the evaluation of needs and gaps and how funds will be leveraged, Table B 16 (page 53/e72) includes a year by year timeline for system changes. For example in year one they will implement the programs shared governance structure with the MEDA Board and Executive Director working with representatives from the city and school district along with the advisory and community boards. They will also develop a shared communications plan, a leadership academy to improve on governance experience and establish a sustainability committee to raise additional funds.

A separate chart, Table 17 (Leveraging Resources) includes specific targets and percentage of the budget that will be made up from public sources and private sources. For example, in year one, an increase in public funding by 7 percent, from private sources by 3 percent, and an 8 percent in in-kind sources.

### **Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses 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**

## Sub Question

**continuum.**

### **Strengths:**

The MPN partnered with the University of California at Berkeley's Center for Latino Policy Research (CLPR) to conduct a comprehensive assessment and segmentation analysis of the Mission District and the target population. More than 20 data sources were used to conduct this work and data included census data, individual and aggregate data from the school system, classroom surveys. (page 55/e74) The applicant also worked with community partners to compile the most accurate neighborhood indicators including financial and economic health indicators. (page 56/e75)

Tables C 1 (page 56/e75) includes an extensive description how each indicator was evaluated. For example age-appropriate school functioning for kindergarten readiness was evaluated with the Brigance Screen II assessment used by the San Francisco school district. It further describes how the screening tool is designed and what it evaluates. Table C 2 then provides the segmentation decisions made based on the information gathered.

In their work they attempted to gather data that was at the lowest possible geographic level to develop a more accurate picture of the target population. As the process moved forward the University shared findings with the project team. This resulted in more sources of information and provided detail on the complexity of the everyday experiences of children and families that are the subject of the proposal.

This detailed information allowed them to make decisions to address the shortfall. For example, 61 percent of the target students in middle school are falling short in regard to academic proficiency for future school success. 90 percent of these students were found to be low income, 1 in 4 lack internet access, and a majority of Latinos are in high need and the Latino population makes up 83 percent of the target population. The segmentation analysis resulted in a decision to focus on academic and social supports to this middle school population, to provide adequate internet access and to implement comprehensive reform models that will include supportive services and that are targeted to the highest need students and families.

### **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:**

The documentation and use of evidence for this proposal is strong. The project worked with Dr. Garcia Bedolla and a team of researchers through the What Works Clearinghouse, and their work included a review of scholarly journals of national recognition and the iE3 database. (page 62/e81)

Table C 2 (page 63/e82) includes a summary of the evidence base for each solution. Appendix F (page 3/e238) provides greater detail on both the segmentation analysis and evidence base. The evidence varies between a mix of strong and moderate.

### **Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses 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 MPN includes annual goals for improvement that are clear and very specific and include not just education related measures but also includes measure of family behavior, activity and well-being. In addition they require a steady level of improvement that is appropriate according to the level of challenge.

They provide Table C (page 65/e84) that includes 19 indicators with the current status of the population in that category. Each year (one through five) has a designated goal expressed in percentage. For example, age appropriate functioning is currently at 46 percent of the population with gradual increases to 54 percent by year five. Annual goals for improvement on were developed based on an assessment of the 1) universe of solutions in the particular area; 2) the number of children and families to be served by solution; and 3) the expected progress over time based on the proposed solutions and time. (page 64/e83)

**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 lead applicant, MEDA has a strong history of working within the community. They currently serve 5500 individuals and families. They also have an established track record which includes assisting in the creation of 200 new home owners, the prevention of foreclosure of 200 homes, assistance in creating 207 new businesses and providing tax payer assistance that provides over \$10 million in tax refunds to community residents.(page 70/e89)

The governance plan includes three bodies which represent parents, student, teachers, principals, government leaders, community based organization members, and school district representatives. (page 66/e85). In addition (page 70/e89), the applicant includes a strong MOU that involves an extensive list of partners including local government units, housing, health workforce development, and higher education as well as including an alignment with the schools.(e 214)

Due to MEDA's extensive work and experience within the target community they have learned a number

### Sub Question

of lessons over time. Based on these lessons they will build capacity by leveraging this knowledge. For example due to the fact that there are language barriers in working with some residents they know they have to offer services and instruction in Spanish and that actions they take must be culturally appropriate. As a result to build capacity they will assist organization to make sure that services are offered in this language and culturally appropriate manner. Further examples are available on specific lessons learned (Table D 2, page 76-77/e95-96) and how this links to proposals to build capacity.

#### **Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses 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 MEDA has a long history with data collection and evaluation tools. MEDA's Executive Director and the organization has twenty years of experience data and outcomes and reporting this longitudinal data and information to federal and local agencies. They are the lead agency for the implementation of SparkPoint which is using Effort to Outcomes a longitudinal database that tracks client outcomes cross agencies. In addition to this, they are serving over 5500 individual through low-income programs and services, MEDA has to track and report on six different federal funding streams. (page 78/e97)

Their partner the John W Gardner Center for Youth and Their Communities (JGC) at Stanford works in deep partnership with the community. They have extensive experience in data across youth-serving agencies and one of their primary initiatives is the Youth Data Archive which links longitudinal data across several agencies. Their data archive includes individual level data on all students in the San Francisco School District.

With this experience and existing data base they will be able to link student level data and data and information to partner agencies. The plan includes a commitment to work with partner agencies to assist in infrastructure, training and one-on-one assistance. As part of this proposal the MPN will have an evaluation plan (page 81/e100) that will provide various partners with implementation and outcomes analysis. Table D.5 (page 85/e104) outlines the lessons learned and the proposal to build capacity based on those lessons.

MPN has also included a series of evaluation research questions, the method of data evaluation and the data sources that will be used. (page 81/e100) Program data will be linked to school-based outcome data with the San Francisco Unified School District. Critical to this are some of the first questions for research, to what extent are the MPN solutions helping children and families? Which groups are making progress and which may need more support?

#### **Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses found.

**Reader's Score: 15**

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

#### Sub Question

**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 proposal highlights past experience in working with multiple non-profit organizations, the Mayor's office and the school district. The proposal includes 38 partners that are a part of the MOU and it aligns each partner's vision and theory of action.

MEDA's experience includes receiving grants from six different federal agencies including the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Small Business Administration, the Administration for Children and Families in the Department of Health and Human Services. In addition, MEDA has received funding from the City of San Francisco as well as numerous foundations and corporations.

In Table D.6 and Table D.7 (page 87-88/e106-107) the applicant lays out a strategy for lessons learned and how these lessons will be used to build capacity. For example, they have learned that partner accountability, clear communication, follow up and follow through are all important. As a result of this lesson learned, they have a strong MOU and will monitor compliance and use data to improve on results and will communicate these results frequently.

The accountability measures are specific and will help build capacity. In the event a partner agency or contractor consistently fails to meet deliverables, MEDA retains the right to cancel the contract. (page 88/e107) The management team will monitor progress based on goals and deliverables and the director of systems will monitor contract compliance. MEDA will use data and evaluation information to gauge progress. (page 88/e107) They are also building capacity through the strong shared vision, theory of action with the partners which is included in the MOU. They will also reinvigorate the partners through the Promise Leadership Academy.

#### **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:**

MEDA has extensive experience in working with multiple non-profit organizations as evidenced by the proposal's 38 partners that are a part of the MOU. The total leveraged funding designated for the project includes over [REDACTED] with [REDACTED] in private dollars. (page 91/e110) They have learned that collaborative fundraising requires dedicated leadership, transparent communication and significant fundraising capacity. As a result, they have already engaged in aggressive conversations to gain support for the MPN.

MEDA also has extensive experience leveraging federal funding funds from a number of sources including the Department of Education, the Small Business Administration, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and the Department of Health and Human Services. In addition, the MEDA has leveraged funds through the City of San Francisco. Supplementing these government resources, MEDA has strong corporate and foundation relationships and this will be used to expand capacity. Some of these relationships include but are not limited to the Kresge Foundation, the San Francisco Foundation, Bank of America, Citibank and Charles Schwab. (page 90/e109)

In Table D.9 (page 92/e111) they have listed how they will blend a combination of funding along

**Sub Question**

program lines. For example, College to Career includes funding from the Gates Foundation and Bridge to Success. Early Learning and Development draws funds from a city pre-school funding source and Race to the Top funding.

**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:**

MEDA proposes to build the capacity of a High Quality Early Learning Network in the Mission District. This plan includes a network of providers, use of the Quality Rating Improvement System (QRIS), professional development and integration and training in regard to data systems.

The network will address ages zero through third grade. It will draw joint funding from city agencies and the State of California and will join together a network that includes Early Head Start, Head Start, parent education providers, and family child care providers. In addition they will participate in the QRIS through the State. It will leverage public and private funds from the city state and federal governments.

All providers will participate in the Quality Rating Improvement System (QRIS) and includes opportunities for workforce and professional development. The needs assessment determined that despite a high level of enrollment in preschool, 95 percent of the target area children are not Kindergarten ready. Through the network preschool providers will access to family supports including health, parent education and other service. (page 94/e113)

**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:**

This proposal represents a strong initiative that seeks to go beyond just providing access to the internet. Their plan will include access to computers and a free community broadband network. (page 95/e114) The proposal includes training for parents and families and seeks to reach its goal of 100 percent access by year five of the plan. (page 65/e84)

**Weaknesses:**

**Reader's Score:** 1

**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:**

n/a

**Weaknesses:**

n/a

**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:**

n/a

**Weaknesses:**

n/a

**Reader's Score:**

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 10/29/2012 04:36 PM