Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** United Way of Northern Utah (U215P120028)

### Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selection Criteria</th>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Points Scored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Need for Project</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Project Design</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Project Services</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of the Management Plan</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>99</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Priority Questions

#### Competitive Preference Priority

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competitive Preference Priority</th>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Points Scored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competitive Preference Priority 4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive Preference Priority 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive Preference Priority 6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive Preference Priority 7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** 105 103
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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. 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:
   Applicant utilized the CDI index which is endorsed by OJJDP as an indicator of community distress level. Applicant uses a multitude of relevant indicators including education, crime, housing, and health.

   Weaknesses:
   N/A

Reader’s Score: 10

2. Geographic Area Description

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

   Strengths:
   The PN area is well defined according to census tracts with a minimum CDI score of 8.

   Weaknesses:
   N/A

Reader’s Score: 5

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. 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:
Sub Question

1. Comprehensive Strategy and Solutions:

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

   Strengths:
   The plan is in alignment with a school district wide plan to implement the University of Virginia School Turnaround Program that is already in progress. Applicant directly addresses the alignment of their theory of change with the school turnaround model.

   Weaknesses:
   N/A

   Reader’s Score: 10

2. Implementation Plan:

   The extent to which the applicant describes a proposal to plan to create a complete continuum of solutions, including early learning through grade 12, college- and career-readiness, and family and community supports, without time and resource gaps that will prepare all children in the neighborhood to attain an excellent education and successfully transition to college and a career.

   Strengths:
   Applicant identifies communities of practice and delineates how that folds into governance structure. Applicant addresses each piece of the continuum. Applicant outlines a detailed plan for the process of evaluation and plan development.

   Weaknesses:
   N/A

   Reader’s Score: 5

3. Identification of Existing Neighborhood Assets:

   The extent to which solutions leverage existing neighborhood assets and coordinate with other efforts, including programs supported by Federal, State, local, and private funds.

   Strengths:
   Applicant has developed a large group of partners to serve a diverse population that includes local education, local government, service providers, and 2 funding sources. Applicant identifies over $10M in federal and state grants being implemented by the LEA.

   Weaknesses:
   N/A

   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: 20

Sub Question

1. Needs Assessment and Segmentation Analysis:

The extent to which the applicant describes how the needs assessment and segmentation analysis, including identifying and describing indicators, will be used during the planning phase to determine each solution within the continuum.

Strengths:
Applicant has identified two partners that specialize in research and facilitating community assessments. Applicant identifies 8 sources of existing data that will be mined and collated. Applicant has outlined a specific plan with timelines and participants for the planning phase.

Weaknesses:
N/A

Reader’s Score: 10

2. Evidence-Based Solutions:

The extent to which the applicant describes how it will determine that solutions are based on the best available evidence including, where available, strong or moderate evidence, and ensure that solutions drive results and lead to changes on indicators.

Strengths:
Applicant presents a table linking indicators, method of collecting data, and possible sources of evidenced based practices that could assist in selecting solutions. Applicant presents a system for CQI derived from ongoing data gathering. Applicant provides a table of possible solutions with strong/moderate evidence.

Weaknesses:
N/A

Reader’s Score: 10

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
Sub Question

1. Ability to Work with Neighborhood Residents:

Experience, lessons learned, and proposal to build capacity of the applicants 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:
Applicant clearly outlines past experiences and documents successes. Applicant demonstrates an ongoing commitment to community partnership and success in bringing those partnerships to fruition. Applicant documents past successes partnering with LEA and local government.

Weaknesses:
Applicant does not document past success with State and Federal government leaders.

Reader’s Score: 9

2. Ability to Utilize Data:

Experience, lessons learned, and proposal to build capacity of applicant's management team and project director in collecting, analyzing, and using data for decision-making, learning, continuous improvement, and accountability.

Strengths:
Applicant identifies initial stakeholder buy-in regarding a shared, centralized database and has made a preliminary decision to engage with an existing PN contractor. Applicant has determined data needs and identified strategies for utilizing data including compliance with confidentiality laws and ongoing management of the database. Applicant has identified which partner will be responsible for running reports and disseminating information to all partner agencies.

Weaknesses:
N/A

Reader’s Score: 15

3. Ability to Create Partnerships:

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

Strengths:
Applicant demonstrates a long history of collaboration with various agencies. The MOU clearly delineates vision alignment and commitment of resources for each partner agency. Applicant addresses accountability plan for the MOU partners.

Weaknesses:
N/A

Reader’s Score: 10
Sub Question

4. Ability to Integrate Funding Streams:

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

Strengths:
Applicant's management team documents previous successes with local, state, and federal funding sources. Applicant counts two local funding sources among its partner agencies. Applicant has a long history of leveraging relationships to fund community programs.

Weaknesses:
N/A

Reader's Score: 10

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 4

1. Comprehensive Local Early Learning Network:

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

Strengths:
Applicant identifies early learning as a priority. Applicant has pre-selected a resource for evaluating existing early learning programs. Applicant identifies an existing national program model to be explored based on the outcomes of the evaluation.

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score: 2

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 5

1. Quality Internet Connectivity:

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:
Applicant has a program in place that will need to be expanded.

Weaknesses:
Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 6

1. Arts and Humanities:

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:
Applicant outlines current resources and their limitations. Applicant includes access to arts in the evaluation plan.

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score: 1

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 7

1. Quality Affordable Housing:

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:
Applicant addresses the need for housing and identifies partners that will participate in working with PN residents to achieve this goal.

Weaknesses:
Applicant does not address whether the PN area is a geographic area that was the subject of an affordable housing transformation grant through Choice Neighborhoods or Hope VI.

Reader's Score: 0
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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. 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 community's schools poor performance reflects the many challenges facing the PN community. Eight of the district's 20 schools are Persistently Lowest Achieving schools and 3 elementary schools have over 50% of students as English Language Learners (e23). The DOJ's Community Disadvantage Index suggests that 40% of the city's census tracts are 90-100% worse off than other US census tracts (e24). Only 61% of seniors graduate high school with a diploma (e26); for one school, the rate is 33% (e26). Twenty percent of adults do not have a diploma (e29). The schools are challenged by high teacher and administrator turnover and high student absenteeism/truancy. Children and families struggle with obesity and poor nutrition, asthma, and dental issues (e29-30), among other challenges. Ogden has higher rates of poverty, unemployment, teen birth, and children in single-parent households than state and national averages. (e34).

Weaknesses:
None.

Reader’s Score: 10

2. Geographic Area Description

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

Strengths:
Ogden is located 30 miles north of Salt Lake City in Weber County. The PN, shown on a map on page e24, will focus efforts on 10 census tracts with the worse Community Disadvantage Index.
Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. 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:

   - Comprehensive Strategy and Solutions:

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

     **Strengths:**
     The partners have a cohesive Theory of Change and have already committed resources to the implementation of nine schools run according to the nationally-recognized UVA Business School's Specialist Turnaround Program (e39). To implement the PN’s theory of change, the PN will utilize nationally-recognized resources, including the IES What Works Clearinghouse (e47).

     **Weaknesses:**
     None.

   - Implementation Plan:

     The extent to which the applicant describes a proposal to plan to create a complete continuum of solutions, including early learning through grade 12, college- and career-readiness, and family and community supports, without time and resource gaps that will prepare all children in the neighborhood to attain an excellent education and successfully transition to college and a career.

     **Strengths:**
     A well-conceived and detailed plan for developing the continuum appears on pages 43-47; the level of detail reflects a great deal of preparation and thought leadership. The PN process involves forming six Communities of Practice to focus on a particular aspect of the core continuum under the general categories of education, family, and community. The Communities are charged with developing a continuum of solutions for that particular piece of the core continuum, including developing collaboration practices, setting priorities, and developing a common evaluation system and an action plan to address assigned indicators (e43). The United Way, YMCA, and Boys and Girls Clubs helping to implement the Community Schools program.

     **Weaknesses:**
     None.
3. Identification of Existing Neighborhood Assets:

The extent to which solutions leverage existing neighborhood assets and coordinate with other efforts, including programs supported by Federal, State, local, and private funds.

Strengths:
The PN partners are already engaged in building on their assets, particularly their schools, through funding and engagement in the UVA Turnaround program. The team also recognizes that silos currently in existence need to be broken down in order to most effectively utilize the strengths of each partner. Table 7 (e41-43) highlights the community partners involved in the effort and the neighborhood assets they offer.

Weaknesses:
More detail about how the assets tie back to particular indicators and goals would be helpful.

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:

Sub Question

1. Needs Assessment and Segmentation Analysis:

The extent to which the applicant describes how the needs assessment and segmentation analysis, including identifying and describing indicators, will be used during the planning phase to determine each solution within the continuum.

Strengths:
Generally speaking, the PN's plan to collect, analyze, and utilize data is very impressive and shows a great deal of reflection and thought. The PN will work with evaluators who have a decade's experience evaluating the PN's programs. They will utilize existing data, including federal, state, United Way, and Ogden city data. Surveys will target neighborhood residents through events or door-to-door collection (e61) and will utilize handheld devices to aid in collection. A 12-variable segmentation analysis will identify areas of need (e63), along with detailed questions (e70-71). Community conversations will offer a forum for PN members to discuss the results of the needs assessment and solicit feedback from community members (e61-62).

Weaknesses:
None.

2. Evidence-Based Solutions:

The extent to which the applicant describes how it will determine that solutions are based on the
Sub Question

best available evidence including, where available, strong or moderate evidence, and ensure that solutions drive results and lead to changes on indicators.

Strengths:
The team shows a familiarity with several excellent research-based resources and plans to use them in its work, as well as eventually contribute to the foundation of knowledge. The PN will utilize the IES What Works Clearinghouse and Erik Harris “Six Steps to Successfully Scale in the Nonprofit Sector” in assessing solutions (e49). They will travel to observe successful programs, including other Promise Neighborhoods awardees. (e50). Tables 9-11 on e65-70 show several potential evidence-based solutions to meeting the needs of various indicators. The PN also plans to work with other PN recipients to create a data system that respects privacy laws and regulations (e55).

Weaknesses:
None.

Reader’s Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. 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. Ability to Work with Neighborhood Residents:

Experience, lessons learned, and proposal to build capacity of the applicants 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:
By the nature of its work, the United Way of Northern Utah is well-positioned to leverage his existing relationships with the community. UWNU funds 61 Ogden nonprofits and its leadership serves on 29 local coalitions, boards, or committees (e54) and has facilitated collaboration among community partners for 15 years in the areas of education, income, and health (e54). PN members have educated state legislators on the community schools strategy, and the PN has developed proven strategies to engage the community, such as focusing on larger goals instead of just implementing programs.

Weaknesses:
None.

Reader’s Score: 10

2. Ability to Utilize Data:

Experience, lessons learned, and proposal to build capacity of applicant’s management team and project director in collecting, analyzing, and using data for decision-making, learning, continuous
improvement, and accountability.

Strengths:
As stated earlier, generally speaking, the PN's plan to collect, analyze, and utilize data is very impressive and shows a great deal of reflection and thought, both in terms of data collection and analysis, as well as in possible research-based decisionmaking. Currently, the PN's partners are collecting multiple streams of data in a variety of isolated platforms, including two different US DOE databases (79). After researching DBs used by other PN recipients, the PN will utilize the Social Solutions Efforts to Outcomes (ETO) database to collect data, develop analyses, and reporting.

Weaknesses:
None.

Reader's Score: 15

3. Ability to Create Partnerships:

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

Strengths:
Fifty five corporate partners and 61 agencies offer funding and significant resources, including renovation funds, enrichment programs, community schools, healthy food options (e 75-77), and all have committed 50/50 contributions. (e83). United Way of Northern Utah has committed over in cash and in-kind contributions (e39). The detailed MOU on e113-126 shows the level of buy-in and alignment already achieved among partners.

Weaknesses:
None.

Reader’s Score: 10

4. Ability to Integrate Funding Streams:

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

Strengths:
Since 2008, the various partners have received over $10m in federal and state grants (e51-52) and have leveraged their own money as well in the implementation of key programs, one of which, Full Service Community Schools, has shown promising results. One partner has leveraged federal TRIO funds for pre-college programs serving K-16 (e53). The project director has nearly 10 years of experience managing federal grant programs and has directed projects of a similar size.

Weaknesses:
None.

Reader’s Score: 10
Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 4

1. Comprehensive Local Early Learning Network:

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

Strengths:

After a needs assessment, the PN will investigate ELN models from Educare/Bounce Centers for young children (e91-92). The team will utilize an assessment framework for early education networks developed at Harvard University.

Weaknesses:

None.

Reader’s Score:  2

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 5

1. Quality Internet Connectivity:

To meet this priority, an applicant must ensure that almost all students in the geographic area proposed to be served have broadband Internet access at home and at school, the knowledge and skills to use broadband internet access effectively, and a connected computing device to support schoolwork.

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader’s Score:

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 6

1. Arts and Humanities:

To meet this priority, an applicant must include in its plan opportunities for children and youth to experience and participate actively in the arts and humanities in their community so as to broaden, enrich, and enliven the educational, cultural, and civic experiences available in the neighborhood.

Strengths:

The PN partners have much experience in arts and humanities programs for young people, including summer arts camps and subsidized violin lessons, and the PN would like to expand these offerings (e92-93).

Weaknesses:

None.
Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 7

1. Quality Affordable Housing:

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:
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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:

   1. 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 proposal clearly describes the education needs of Ogden, in terms of the number of Persistently Lowest Achieving Schools, their participation in SIG grants (and their adoption of transformation models), and student population needs. The proposal provides comparative data from the U.S. Department of Justice that suggests that 40 percent of the neighborhoods in Ogden have living conditions that are far worse than other communities in the country (p. 4) and that the neighborhoods are characterized by substandard housing and residents with low incomes (pp. 15-16). The high need neighborhoods and the 10 schools (8 of which are PLAS and 9 of which are transformation schools) that would participate in the initiative are described (pp. 4-5). The proposal presents achievement data that suggest that students attending the targeted schools underperform relative to state averages in both language arts and mathematics (pp. 5-6), and that high school drop out and graduation rates are considerably higher (p. 6) in the targeted schools. The proposal depicts the high turnover in teachers and district leadership, low rates of preschool participation, high rate of student absenteeism (with elementary grades highlighted), and low adult education attainment (pp. 7-9). The proposal presents background information from national research organizations to bolster the argument that chronic absenteeism predicts school dropout (p. 8). The proposal also provides health-related information about the young people in the targeted neighborhoods, in terms of their obesity (about double the state average), poor nutrition, tobacco use, dental problems, low immunization rates, and prevalence of crime, juvenile crime, drug use, gang involvement, and other health-related indicators (pp. 9-15).

      Weaknesses:
      None

      Reader’s Score: 10

2. Geographic Area Description

      The extent to which the geographically defined area has been described.
Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. 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:

Sub Question

Strengths:
The proposal clearly describes Ogden in terms of its location, population size and composition, schools, and amenities. The proposal includes a map that displays the neighborhoods that would participate in the Promise Neighborhood initiative (p. 4).

Weaknesses:
None

Reader’s Score: 5

Sub Question

1. Comprehensive Strategy and Solutions:

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

Strengths:
The proposal clearly describes the four goals that focus the project (data collection and use, academic success and wellness for students and families, develop a plan to scale up a strategy for change) and that align with the PN program (pp. 18-19). The proposal provides a theory of change and describes recent planning efforts in the district that have involved the support of the University of Virginia and that center on the development of Community Schools (pp. 19-20). The proposal presents a series of actions for creating comprehensive solutions that build logically on one another (pp. 20-21). The contributions from each partner, including the school districts, area institutions of higher education, community groups, private philanthropies, and state and municipal agencies, are described (pp. 21-23) and appear to cover the array of educational and developmental outcomes that the PN initiative targets. The proposal states that the partners will recruit community members through the PTSA and local churches, an important strategy for buy-in (p. 23) and presents a structure for convening, leading, and focusing six communities of practice that align with the strategies of the implementation plan (pp. 23-26). The responsibility for leading and channeling information from the communities rests with the OUPNs board of directors (p. 26). The proposal describes how children and youth not living in the neighborhood but who attend local schools will have access to school-based services and to services provided by partners (such as the Y and Boys and Girls Club) (p. 28).

Weaknesses:
None

Reader’s Score: 10

2. Implementation Plan:

The extent to which the applicant describes a proposal to plan to create a complete continuum of solutions, including early learning through grade 12, college- and career-readiness, and family and community supports, without time and resource gaps that will prepare all children in the
Sub Question

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

Strengths:
The proposal states that it will rely on a strategy of creating community schools that feature cradle-to-career services (5 of the 6 target schools are community schools) (p. 27) and describes the steps that are taken to develop a community school in the district (pp. 27-28). The proposal relates the process for determining which solutions to implement, which includes data analysis by the communities of practice (all of which will follow the same guidelines) and a small-scale pilot (pp. 29-30). The proposal provides for the professional development of the communities of practice, to build their capacity (p. 30).

The proposal describes the array of programs and services to be planned, and links the programs and services to work already underway in the city and neighborhoods and organizations already involved (pp. 30-35). The proposal clearly identifies the additional contributions the PN funds would make to the existing efforts in early childhood education, by including connections through communities of practice) (p. 31).

Weaknesses:
None

Reader’s Score: 5

3. Identification of Existing Neighborhood Assets:

The extent to which solutions leverage existing neighborhood assets and coordinate with other efforts, including programs supported by Federal, State, local, and private funds.

Strengths:
The proposal clearly describes how the PN funds would extend the work underway in the district (p. 34), through the needs assessment, research of best practices, and development of a strong strategic plan. The proposal enumerates the ways that the project partners have collaborated on similar initiatives on education and wellness (pp. 34-35). The proposal presents ideas for stimulating collaboration with other PN recipients and fostering greater buy-in at the municipal and state levels (e.g., by hosting informational breakfasts) (p. 35). The proposal lists the federal, state, and other monies that have targeted school improvement in the targeted neighborhood (pp. 31-33) and describes their use.

Weaknesses:
None

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: 20

Sub Question

1. Needs Assessment and Segmentation Analysis:
Sub Question

The extent to which the applicant describes how the needs assessment and segmentation analysis, including identifying and describing indicators, will be used during the planning phase to determine each solution within the continuum.

Strengths:
The proposal identifies two subcontractors (one of which has a 10-year history of working with the school district) that will assume responsibility for conducting the needs assessment and segmentation analysis (pp. 37-38). In terms of the needs assessment, the proposal states that existing data, survey data, and data from a series of community conversations will be integrated and reported to the 6 communities of practice, the governing board, and the Ogden community. The proposal names the databases to be consulted and relates the information to the indicators of interest to PN (pp. 38-40). Web-based focus groups, community surveys, and community conversations will be conducted to discover needs that might not be covered in exiting databases (pp. 40-42). The proposal presents a strategy for maximizing the chance that a cross-section of residents will be contacted, for example through outreach at neighborhood events, and the use of hand held devices and incentives (pp. 41-42).

In terms of the segmentation analysis, the proposal presents variables that will be used to analyze the data, which will result in information about high needs groups in need of particular services (p. 43).

The proposal includes a timeline that appears to be ambitious, but achievable (p. 44).

The proposal includes specific information about the data collection methods to be used to address particular indicators, and also provides examples of possible solutions that might be used to address the indicators (pp. 45-50).

Weaknesses:
None

Reader’s Score: 10

2. Evidence-Based Solutions:

The extent to which the applicant describes how it will determine that solutions are based on the best available evidence including, where available, strong or moderate evidence, and ensure that solutions drive results and lead to changes on indicators.

Strengths:
The proposal indicates that the solutions pursued will be based on moderate to strong evidence, and mentions the What Works Clearinghouse and other organizations as information sources (pp. 26-27). The proposal includes a mechanism for reporting this information to the relevant communities of practice, the board of directors, and the Ogden community (p. 43) and presents a series of questions that will guide the discussion of the results and directing of resources to the highest need groups (pp. 50-51).

Weaknesses:
None

Reader’s Score: 10

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
Sub Question

1. Ability to Work with Neighborhood Residents:

Experience, lessons learned, and proposal to build capacity of the applicants 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 proposal states that the planning initiative is a natural extension of four years of work involving the principal partners, including the United Way of Northern Utah, Ogden United, and Ogden School District, along with a cross-section of parents, families, and community members (pp. 52-53). The efforts have included the adoption and implementation of the community schools model, as well as focused outreach to political decision-makers to solicit buy-in (pp. 52-53). The proposal provides concrete information regarding partners leadership and success in launching complex, sustained planning and implementation projects that require broad buy-in and sustained commitment, and the lessons learned, such as the articulation of big goals and importance of trust building (pp. 53-55).

Weaknesses:
None

Reader's Score: 10

2. Ability to Utilize Data:

Experience, lessons learned, and proposal to build capacity of applicant's management team and project director in collecting, analyzing, and using data for decision-making, learning, continuous improvement, and accountability.

Strengths:
The proposal describes preliminary research conducted by OUPN to create a database that would handle the array of indicators and address the key decision-making needs associated with the planning process (pp. 58-59). The proposal indicates that the planning initiative will rely on an existing database, the Efforts To Outcomes (ETO), to organize information, and describes the strengths associated with using a database that is shared by other PN recipients and the features that the proposed project require (p. 59). The proposal lists the ways that the project partners have collected and tracked data, which indicates an existing capacity to use data for ongoing decision-making (p. 59). The proposal provides for privacy of individuals in targeted neighborhoods (pp. 60-61). The proposal attends to the need for rapid time decision-making (pp. 61-62) and describes the process evaluation that will document the planning process (p. 62).

Weaknesses:
None

Reader's Score: 15

3. Ability to Create Partnerships:

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

Strengths:
The proposal clearly describes the buy-in for the planning initiative and the consensus around the four goals. The proposal presents the alignment among the missions of the 11 partners and the partners theories of action and change (pp. 63-64 and Appendix). The proposal presents a concise account of its governing structure, which consists of the Ogden United Board of Directors, which oversee the work of the project director and other staff and the efforts of the 6 communities of practice (pp. 64-65). The proposal describes a monthly meeting structure of the Board.

The proposal briefly presents the experience of the project director, who appears to have the experiences necessary to lead the initiative (p. 55, pp. 65-66), and the descriptions of other staff positions (pp. 66-67). The proposal indicates that all partners will be evaluated twice during the planning period to ensure that they have fulfilled their commitments (p. 68).

The proposal describes how community input will be woven into the planning process, for example, through focus groups, board membership, and community outreach (p. 68).

Weaknesses:
None

Reader’s Score: 10

4. Ability to Integrate Funding Streams:

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

Strengths:
The proposal documents the partners success in obtaining funding from corporate partners, community agencies, and private foundations (pp. 69-70) and assigns the project director with the responsibility for identifying and integrating funding sources (p. 70). The proposal also pledges to work with the national PN evaluator (p. 71).

Weaknesses:
None

Reader’s Score: 10

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 4

1. Comprehensive Local Early Learning Network:

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

Strengths:
The proposal provides a cohesive and comprehensive account of how it intends to expand an existing early learning program.
Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 5

1. Quality Internet Connectivity:
   To meet this priority, an applicant must ensure that almost all students in the geographic area proposed to be served have broadband Internet access at home and at school, the knowledge and skills to use broadband internet access effectively, and a connected computing device to support schoolwork.

   Strengths:

   Weaknesses:

   Reader's Score: 2

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 6

1. Arts and Humanities:
   To meet this priority, an applicant must include in its plan opportunities for children and youth to experience and participate actively in the arts and humanities in their community so as to broaden, enrich, and enliven the educational, cultural, and civic experiences available in the neighborhood.

   Strengths:
   - The proposal makes a compelling argument for including the arts and humanities in its effort to improve the targeted neighborhood.

   Weaknesses:
   - None

   Reader's Score: 1

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 7

1. Quality Affordable Housing:
   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: