

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 10/19/2016 09:28 AM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Berea College (U215N160027)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Need for Project</b>		
1. Need	15	15
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	30	30
<b>Quality of Project Services</b>		
1. Project Services	20	20
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	20	20
<b>Adequacy of Resources</b>		
1. Adequacy of Resources	15	15
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	100
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
1. Priority	2	2
2. Priority	2	0
3. Priority	2	2
4. Priority	2	2
<b>Sub Total</b>	8	6
<b>Total</b>	108	106

# Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - Panel - 2: 84.215N

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

Applicant: Berea College (U215N160027)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Need for Project

1. The magnitude or severity of the problems to be addressed by the proposed project as described by indicators of need and other relevant indicators identified in part by the needs assessment and segmentation analysis.

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

The extent to which specific gaps or weaknesses in services, infrastructure, or opportunities have been identified and will be addressed by the proposed project, including the nature and magnitude of those gaps or weaknesses.

**Suggested Point Ranges: Not Addressed: 0; Poorly Developed: 1-5; Adequately Developed: 6-10; Strongly Developed: 11-14; Fully Developed: 15**

#### General:

Strengths: The applicant, Berea College, strongly demonstrates the severity of the need for this project. For example, the isolation of the area causes poverty levels to be high and income and educational attainment to be low. (page e29) The applicant conducted an extensive needs assessment and segmentation analysis to determine the severity of the problems. (page e30) As a result, the applicant identified fifteen significant indicators to guide the program. For example, indicator seven found that 62% and 78% of area graduates will need remedial courses in English and math, when they enter college. (page e41) In addition, indicator nine found that a very small number of students (6.19%) eat the recommended five servings of fruits and vegetables a day and that there is a significant lack of student physical activity. (page e44) These indicators will be addressed by an appropriate continuum of solutions identified by the chart on pages e27-e29.

Weaknesses: No weaknesses noted.

Strengths: The applicant provides a detailed description of the geographic area. The College is applying for funding under Absolute Priority 2 and will exclusively serve LEAs eligible under the 2016 Rural Low-Income School program. The area, Knox County, Kentucky, is a Promise Neighborhood and is 386 square miles in central Appalachia. (page e51) This is a remote, coal country area where two-thirds of the residents who live in the county are at least fifteen miles from town. The area is hilly and mountainous terrain, which is not easy to travel in bad weather. The geographic area also affects the economy as the area has lost more than 8,000 coal related jobs. (page e52)

Weaknesses: No weaknesses noted.

Strengths: The applicant clearly identifies fifteen specific gaps or weaknesses in services, infrastructure, or opportunities that will be addressed by the program. A chart is provided that details the significant nature and magnitude of each gap or weakness. The applicant provides a program solution for each problem. (pages e53-e55, Appendix F pages 23-29)

Weaknesses: No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 15

### Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

- 1. 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.**

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

**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.**

**The extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible.**

**The extent to which the proposed project is supported by strong theory.**

**Suggested Point Ranges: Not Addressed: 0; Poorly Developed: 1-11; Adequately Developed: 12-23; Strongly Developed: 24-29; Fully Developed: 30**

**General:**

**Strengths:** The applicant details a complete continuum of strong solutions for early learning through grade 12, college- and career-readiness, and family and community supports. The project design also includes a detailed description of solutions for each indicator, as well as the cost and saturation rate, source of funding, implementation plan and segmentation analysis. Activities are clearly connected to the solutions for need indicators. In addition, all targeted interventions will serve more students each year. (pages e59-62 and Appendix F e264-299)

**Weaknesses:** No weaknesses noted.

**Strengths:**The program clearly focuses on implementing interventions with a strong evidence base. For example, for Early Learning and Development, the applicant has identified three evidence-based Programs: Doors to Discovery, Pre-K Mathematics and Creative Curriculum for Preschool to enhance the quality of early childhood learning. Other evidence-based interventions such as Success for All, Fast ForWord, Accelerated Math, and Advanced Placement Incentive Program will support reading and math. (page e69 and Appendix F) Overall the program will utilize solutions based on the best available evidence. Two studies have been documented for each intervention. (page e70)

**Weaknesses:** No weaknesses noted.

**Strengths:**The applicant clearly identifies existing assets and programs to maximize resources, which are a mixture of federal, state or local funds. Appropriate resources are identified and detailed for each program solution. For example, Eastern Kentucky University will: provide students with mentoring, tutoring, college-access information; and provide high school teachers with professional development on math and literacy content.

**Weaknesses:** No weaknesses noted.

**Strengths:** The detailed evaluation plan includes the use of effective objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project. Measures include quantitative and qualitative data for each of the five indicators. (pages e79-e83) The evaluation will be conducted by an experienced evaluation team, REACH of Louisville. Inc., who are experienced in successfully meeting federal data collection and reporting requirements. (page e83)

**Weaknesses:** No weaknesses noted.

**Strengths:** The applicant provides a detailed logic model that clearly demonstrates the project is supported by strong theory. The model includes: the needs to be addressed, the continuum of solutions from birth to career, short term goals, long term goals and the ultimate vision. (page e86)

**Weaknesses:** No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 30

### Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Services

1. **The likelihood that the services to be provided by the proposed project will lead to improvement in the achievement of students as measured against rigorous academic standards.**

**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.**

**Suggested Point Ranges: Not Addressed: 0; Poorly Developed: 1-6; Adequately Developed: 7-13; Strongly Developed: 14-19; Fully Developed: 20**

#### General:

Strengths: The detailed and tiered intervention system/program is designed around the integration of instructional programs with a strong evidence base and related professional development. (page e88) As demonstrated by the Logic Model, the program will offer services that effectively lead to improved achievement in math, reading and English language arts as measured against rigorous academic standards. For example, student achievement will be measured by the Kentucky Performance Rating for Educational Progress (grades K-8), and by state mandated End Of Course exams in English II and Algebra II (grades 9-12). (page e87)

Weaknesses: No weaknesses noted.

Strengths: The applicant, Berea College, has extensive experience in working with multiple non-profit and government partners. This project has many strong formal and informal partners, which are held accountable through systems of formal and informal MOUs, contractual and reimbursement agreements, and continuous communication with partner organizations. (page e94) The applicant provides detailed information about managing partnerships. For example, a Management Board will have strong, mutual accountability to shared goals and will discuss progress in an open, constructive forum with ample resources for building capacity to reach the program's shared vision. (page e95) A Memorandum of Understanding is included in Appendix C and clearly describes each formal partner's commitment. This MOU clearly defines the specific financial support of each entity and partner accountability requirements. (page e95)

Weaknesses: No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 20

### Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. **Working with the neighborhood and its residents; the schools; the LEA in which those schools are located; Federal, State, and local government leaders; and other service providers.**

**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.**

**Suggested Point Ranges: Not Addressed: 0; Poorly Developed: 1-6; Adequately Developed: 7-13; Strongly Developed: 14-19; Fully Developed: 20**

#### General:

Strengths: The applicant has extensive (through another Promise Neighborhood grant) experience in working with residents, other colleges, LEAs, Federal, State, and local government leaders, as well as service providers. The applicant has formed a comprehensive and effective management team and a management board to provide guidance and direction for the project. The 25 member management board will serve as the governance body and be responsible for oversight of the budget and approval of changes to the plan. Both the team and the management board have

representation from the key partners and residents. The applicant will also form a family advisory council. (page e100)

Weaknesses: No weaknesses noted.

Strengths: Experiences with other programs such as GEAR UP and with a 2011 Promise Neighborhood implementation project has given the applicant the capacity to evaluate this project effectively. For example, the program data system clearly links appropriate data from multiple systems. The longitudinal, web-based, data system will incorporate, (through data collection and downloads from all appropriate sources), record-level data on student demographics, student performance, CCR targets, student attendance, graduation rates, college going and college remediation. (page e108)

This data will be analyzed and used to guide the program and make adjustments if needed. The evaluation strategy is coordinated with the national evaluation. (page e111)

Weaknesses: No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 20**

### **Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources**

- 1. The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the number of persons to be served and to the anticipated results and benefits.**

**The extent to which the applicant demonstrates that it has the resources to operate the project beyond the length of the grant, including a multi-year financial and operating model and accompanying plan; the demonstrated commitment of any partners; evidence of broad support from stakeholders (e.g., LEAs, city government, other nonprofits) critical to the project's long-term success; or more than one of these types of evidence.**

**Suggested Point Ranges: Not Addressed: 0; Poorly Developed: 1-5; Adequately Developed: 6-10; Strongly Developed: 11-14; Fully Developed: 15**

#### **General:**

Strengths: The proposed program will provide direct services to 10,347 target area children, youth and their families with an annual federal investment average of less than \$580 per child. (page e112) Funding for schools in the target area is very limited and the plan for this project is to bring services to scale for all target area students over the course of the project period. Activities funded by this program will be adequate to effectively and efficiently produce long-lasting, systemic change. (pages e112-e114)

Weaknesses: No weaknesses noted.

Strengths: The applicant clearly demonstrates that the proposed project has the resources, infrastructure and partnerships necessary to operate the project beyond the length of the grant period. For example, the key elements of sustainability include: an endowment to fund leadership and fundraising functions; continually seeking funding; collaborating with LEAs and partners for program integration: cultivating community partnerships for sustainable and effective programs; and utilizing strong evaluation to determine the most significant practices. (page e114) In addition, key partners such as LEAs, governmental agencies and nonprofits have already evidenced commitment to long-term success. (page e116)

Weaknesses: No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 15**

### **Priority Questions**

#### **Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority**

- 1. Competitive Preference Priority 1  
0 or 2 Points**

## Improving Early Learning Development and Outcomes

Projects that are designed to improve early learning and development outcomes across one or more of the essential domains of school readiness (as defined in this notice) for children from birth through third grade (or for any age group within this range) through a focus on improving the coordination and alignment among early learning and development systems and between such systems and elementary education systems, including coordination and alignment in engaging and supporting families and improving transitions for children along the birth-through-third grade continuum, in accordance with applicable privacy laws.

### General:

Strengths: The proposed program clearly addresses this Competitive Preference Priority 1 as the applicant will ensure delivery of a program with high-quality programming centered on school readiness and aligned with state early learning standards. (page e117) The detailed plan will include building the capacity of current early learning providers and encouraging new programs, (center and homebased). (page e118) The applicant will ensure that families, early care and education providers, school staff and community partners work together to provide environments and developmental experiences that promote growth and learning so that all children (birth through third grade) in the target area are served. (page e120)

Weaknesses: No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 2

## 2. Competitive Preference Priority 2 0 or 2 Points

### 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 FY 2009 or later years. To be eligible under this priority, the applicant must either: (1) be able to demonstrate that it has received a Choice Neighborhoods or HOPE VI grant; or (2) provide, in its application, a memorandum of understanding between it and a partner that is a recipient of a Choice Neighborhoods or HOPE VI grant. The memorandum must indicate a commitment on the part of the applicant and partner to coordinate implementation and align resources to the greatest extent practicable.

### General:

Strengths: No strengths noted.

Weaknesses: Competitive Preference Priority 2 is not addressed.

Reader's Score: 0

## 3. Competitive Preference Priority 3 0 or 2 Points

### Promise Zones

This priority is for projects that are designed to serve and coordinate with a federally designated Promise Zone.

**General:**

Strengths: The proposed program will be located in the only federally designated rural Promise Zone: the Southeastern Kentucky Promise Zone. (page e121) A letter certifying the application and HUD Form 50153 signed by the authorized representative of the lead, HUD designated Promise Zone organization is attached. (Appendix H).

Weaknesses: No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 2**

**4. Competitive Preference Priority 4  
0 or 2 Points**

**High School and Transition to College**

**Increasing the number and proportion of high-need students who are academically prepared for, enroll in, or complete on time college, other postsecondary education, or other career and technical education.**

**General:**

Strengths: The applicant clearly addresses Competitive Preference Priority 4. There is a well-developed plan, based on proven practices and research, to ensure that high-need students enroll in postsecondary institutions prepared for success. For example, the applicant has researched and identified three critical factors that will greatly impact student persistence in college. These factors include: 1) research-based services to promote/increase college fit; 2) summer mentoring and bridge programs; and 3) connections to on-campus resources and advocates. (pages e122-e125)

Weaknesses: No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 2**

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 10/19/2016 09:28 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 11/01/2016 07:47 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Berea College (U215N160027)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Need for Project</b>		
1. Need	15	15
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	30	30
<b>Quality of Project Services</b>		
1. Project Services	20	19
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	20	20
<b>Adequacy of Resources</b>		
1. Adequacy of Resources	15	15
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	99
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
1. Priority	2	2
2. Priority	2	0
3. Priority	2	2
4. Priority	2	2
<b>Sub Total</b>	8	6
<b>Total</b>	108	105

# Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - Panel - 2: 84.215N

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

Applicant: Berea College (U215N160027)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Need for Project

1. The magnitude or severity of the problems to be addressed by the proposed project as described by indicators of need and other relevant indicators identified in part by the needs assessment and segmentation analysis.

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

The extent to which specific gaps or weaknesses in services, infrastructure, or opportunities have been identified and will be addressed by the proposed project, including the nature and magnitude of those gaps or weaknesses.

**Suggested Point Ranges: Not Addressed: 0; Poorly Developed: 1-5; Adequately Developed: 6-10; Strongly Developed: 11-14; Fully Developed: 15**

#### General:

Strengths: Well developed data collection strategy. Appropriate indicators, based on thoughtful and compelling quantitative and qualitative research.

Geographically area well identified and carefully described. Research about geographic area well integrated in to needs assessment.

The proposal presented an analysis of gaps in services and infrastructure based on substantial research and experience in the region.

Weaknesses: None identified.

Reader's Score: 15

### Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. 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.

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

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.

The extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative

data to the extent possible.

The extent to which the proposed project is supported by strong theory.

**Suggested Point Ranges: Not Addressed: 0; Poorly Developed: 1-11; Adequately Developed: 12-23; Strongly Developed: 24-29; Fully Developed: 30**

**General:**

Strengths: The plan is very well designed, including supports and interventions both in and out-of-school time for 15 schools, reaching students from birth to age 24. All proposed interventions are evidence-based. Partnering organizations have strong connection and familiarity with Knox PN area.

All proposed solutions and interventions are evidenced-based, and proposal identifies strong research for interventions for the entire cohort, but also for subsets. (page e62).

Proposal demonstrated thorough understanding and knowledge with proposed PN area's assets. It is clear that thoughtful planning and relationship building were carried out with care and diligence prior to this application.

Well defined goals, with appropriate indicators based on a strong theory of change. High level of detailed evaluation modalities. Experienced external evaluator with concrete plan to integrate evaluation efforts throughout program implementation to provide guidance for course corrections. Of particular importance, the proposal detailed ways the project will support school leadership to use data to shape instruction by providing access to web-based tool ASSIST. (page e69)

The proposed project is based on a strong theory of change, (TOC). The solutions and interventions are well aligned with TOC, and are evidence-based.

Weaknesses: None identified.

**Reader's Score: 30**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Services**

- 1. The likelihood that the services to be provided by the proposed project will lead to improvement in the achievement of students as measured against rigorous academic standards.**

**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.**

**Suggested Point Ranges: Not Addressed: 0; Poorly Developed: 1-6; Adequately Developed: 7-13; Strongly Developed: 14-19; Fully Developed: 20**

**General:**

Strengths: Very clear set of standards and conditions identified in order to improve student achievement in proposed PN schools. (page e87). Evidence of understanding that students will need different types of interventions at different times, thus the implementation of a tiered intervention system, the Response to Intervention (RTI) system. (page e92).

Well defined partnership model, with documentation of partner's commitment to theory of change and theory of action. A process of accountability for effective partnerships has been created; the Management Board.

The proposed Knox PN has key elements in place to deliver a successful program. The LEA in this proposed PN project is well positioned, and has the capacity to provide collaboration infrastructure, and has experience partnering with schools, community-based organizations and Federal, State and local government leaders. The Management Board, inclusive of key stakeholders, is an effective mechanism to create a common vision for students and provide

accountability for the project. The Family Advisory Council, including youth participation, structurally connected to the Management Board, will ensure that continuous feedback is provided.

Weaknesses: As noted on page e88, in order to improve education outcomes of students, the 15 participating public schools must be improved in 5 years. All 15 Knox PN schools will go through a voluntary accreditation process. With results of self-evaluation, a plan will be developed to improve each school. It will be important to develop annual benchmarks for school improvement and course correction steps and accountability, taking into consideration school and project leadership and personnel turnover.

**Reader's Score: 19**

### **Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan**

- 1. Working with the neighborhood and its residents; the schools; the LEA in which those schools are located; Federal, State, and local government leaders; and other service providers.**

**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.**

**Suggested Point Ranges: Not Addressed: 0; Poorly Developed: 1-6; Adequately Developed: 7-13; Strongly Developed: 14-19; Fully Developed: 20**

#### **General:**

Strengths: The proposed Knox PN has key elements in place to deliver a successful program. The LEA in this proposed PN project is well positioned, and has the capacity to provide collaboration infrastructure, and has experience partnering with schools, community-based organizations and Federal, State and local government leaders. The Management Board, inclusive of key stakeholders, is an effective mechanism to create a common vision for students and provide accountability for the project. The Family Advisory Council, including youth participation, structurally connected to the Management Board, will ensure that continuous feedback is provided.

The Knox PN project proposal fully addressed how data will be used to make decisions and provide accountability for partnering organizations and schools.

Weaknesses: None identified.

**Reader's Score: 20**

### **Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources**

- 1. The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the number of persons to be served and to the anticipated results and benefits.**

**The extent to which the applicant demonstrates that it has the resources to operate the project beyond the length of the grant, including a multi-year financial and operating model and accompanying plan; the demonstrated commitment of any partners; evidence of broad support from stakeholders (e.g., LEAs, city government, other nonprofits) critical to the project's long-term success; or more than one of these types of evidence.**

**Suggested Point Ranges: Not Addressed: 0; Poorly Developed: 1-5; Adequately Developed: 6-10; Strongly Developed: 11-14; Fully Developed: 15**

**General:**

Strengths: The proposed costs are reasonable in relation to scale of project.

It is clear that Berea College is committed to the goals of the PN project, and that it has developed deep relationships with key stakeholders to support student's educational achievement in the area.

Weaknesses: None identified.

**Reader's Score: 15**

**Priority Questions**

**Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority**

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 1  
0 or 2 Points**

**Improving Early Learning Development and Outcomes**

**Projects that are designed to improve early learning and development outcomes across one or more of the essential domains of school readiness (as defined in this notice) for children from birth through third grade (or for any age group within this range) through a focus on improving the coordination and alignment among early learning and development systems and between such systems and elementary education systems, including coordination and alignment in engaging and supporting families and improving transitions for children along the birth-through-third grade continuum, in accordance with applicable privacy laws.**

**General:**

Strengths: Project has well identified goals and outcomes for early learning for children birth-3rd grade.

Weaknesses: None identified.

**Reader's Score: 2**

**2. Competitive Preference Priority 2  
0 or 2 Points**

**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 FY 2009 or later years. To be eligible under this priority, the applicant must either: (1) be able to demonstrate that it has received a Choice Neighborhoods or HOPE VI grant; or (2) provide, in its application, a memorandum of understanding between it and a partner that is a recipient of a Choice Neighborhoods or HOPE VI grant. The memorandum must indicate a commitment on the part of the applicant and partner to coordinate implementation and align resources to the greatest extent practicable.**

**General:**

Not applicable for this application.

**Reader's Score: 0**

**3. Competitive Preference Priority 3  
0 or 2 Points**

**Promise Zones**

**This priority is for projects that are designed to serve and coordinate with a federally designated Promise Zone.**

**General:**

Strengths: Southeastern Kentucky Promise Zone's coordinator, Sandi Curd, is a member of the Management Board. (page e72)

Weaknesses: None identified.

**Reader's Score: 2**

**4. Competitive Preference Priority 4  
0 or 2 Points**

**High School and Transition to College**

**Increasing the number and proportion of high-need students who are academically prepared for, enroll in, or complete on time college, other postsecondary education, or other career and technical education.**

**General:**

Strengths: This is a strong proposal, based on a theory of change, and theory of action, identifying evidence-based interventions and solutions to increase number of high-need students to enroll in, or complete post-secondary education.

Weaknesses: None identified.

**Reader's Score: 2**

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 11/01/2016 07:47 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 10/18/2016 07:40 AM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Berea College (U215N160027)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Need for Project</b>		
1. Need	15	15
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	30	30
<b>Quality of Project Services</b>		
1. Project Services	20	20
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	20	20
<b>Adequacy of Resources</b>		
1. Adequacy of Resources	15	15
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	100
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
1. Priority	2	2
2. Priority	2	0
3. Priority	2	2
4. Priority	2	2
<b>Sub Total</b>	8	6
<b>Total</b>	108	106

# Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - Panel - 2: 84.215N

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

Applicant: Berea College (U215N160027)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Need for Project

1. The magnitude or severity of the problems to be addressed by the proposed project as described by indicators of need and other relevant indicators identified in part by the needs assessment and segmentation analysis.

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

The extent to which specific gaps or weaknesses in services, infrastructure, or opportunities have been identified and will be addressed by the proposed project, including the nature and magnitude of those gaps or weaknesses.

**Suggested Point Ranges: Not Addressed: 0; Poorly Developed: 1-5; Adequately Developed: 6-10; Strongly Developed: 11-14; Fully Developed: 15**

#### General:

##### Strengths:

The applicant, an institution of higher education, plans to provide services to 10,347 students in a region located in a current Promise Zone, the first rural Promise Zone (page 3). Based on a needs assessment and segmentation analysis that employed a review of data, surveys, focus groups, and meetings, the applicant establishes a strong need for the project. It has identified 15 indicators that describe both in quantitative and qualitative data a need for the project. For example, the applicant includes Indicator three which examines the number and percentage of children, from birth to kindergarten entry, participating in center-based or formal home-based early learning settings or programs (page 8). To support the indicator, the applicant indicates that only 24 licensed and regulated childcare sites exist and serve only 7.3% to 60.2% of the eligible early learning population (page 9). Other indicators address school-age population, attendance rates, graduation rates, physical activity, dietary conditions, and travel time. The information, which is timely and appropriate, establishes a strong need for the project.

The applicant indicates that the homogeneous population of the county faces similar economic, educational, and health challenges are in one neighborhood (page 25). Focusing on two specific towns, the applicant reports that there are 2,099 children between the ages of zero and four, 5,390 students between the ages of five and 17, and 2,858 youth between the ages of 18 and 24. The applicant also provides a description of the physical character of the region as well as providing specific information concerning poverty rates. For example, the applicant reports that 22% of the children live in poverty (page 26). Only 10% of adults have a bachelor's degree as of 2014. This information provides a clear description of the geographical area being served.

For each of the specific indicators, the applicant provides specific gaps and weaknesses in services as well as in other programs in the geographical area. For example, for Indicator 5, the applicant indicates that 17% to 37% of the students are chronically absent from school (page 28). At the same time, attendance at the sixth, seventh, eighth, and ninth grades ranged from 90 to 96%. To address this specific issue, the applicant is proposing various educational programs in the Promise Schools, additional family and school coordination, and wellness and safety programs. The response by the applicant is detailed and comprehensive.

##### Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

**Reader's Score: 15**

### **Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design**

- 1. 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.**

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

**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.**

**The extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible.**

**The extent to which the proposed project is supported by strong theory.**

**Suggested Point Ranges: Not Addressed: 0; Poorly Developed: 1-11; Adequately Developed: 12-23; Strongly Developed: 24-29; Fully Developed: 30**

#### **General:**

##### **Strengths:**

The applicant indicates that its project design is focused on four foundational areas. Included in those areas are programs aimed at improving early learning and development which involve families and other caregivers. Included also is the development of Promise Schools which include real world applications, student interventions, and an academic case management process (page 31). In addition, the proposed project will include activities and services that will transform schools in conjunction with families and parents working toward literacy development (page 32). The fourth area deals with the wellness and safety conditions for both students and parents and integrating them into the academic curriculum of the schools and into the social and emotional competencies of the students (page 32). This foundation is supported by specific activities that address the basic indicators developed in the needs section. For example, the Promise Schools will focus on Indicators 4 through 7 which deal with academic proficiency, attendance, graduation rates, and postsecondary success (pages 33-35). Included in the design are specific activities to address the indicators. For example, to improve academic proficiency, the applicant is proposing a new evidence based math and reading program, out of school learning opportunities, parent institutes and workshops, and a digital library (page 33). In support of these proposed solutions, the applicant describes its management structure (page 40) as well as a timeline for completion (page 41). These proposed programs and services clearly address the complete continuum of solutions.

The applicant provides specific documentation for its proposed solutions that are based on timely and appropriate research studies and reports. For each of its proposed interventions, the applicant identifies specific research supporting its impact and previous success. For example, the proposed Accelerated Math program at the middle school level is supported by evidence standards included in the What Works Clearinghouse as well as specific research from Nunnery and Ross (2007) (page 47). These specific examples provide strong evidence that the proposed solutions will function effectively.

The applicant provides information concerning how existing assets in the Promise Neighborhood will assist the proposed

project in accomplishing its outcomes. For example, the applicant indicates that seven current assets, which include various types of organizations, will provide services and assistance to its proposed Early Learning and Development solution. Included are hospitals, health care projects, public library, and faith based community organizations (page 50). The applicant provides similar information for its other proposed solutions that reflect a responsible use of existing resources.

The evaluation process described by the applicant seeks to use both quantitative and qualitative data to support programs aimed at addressing the various indicators established in the needs assessment. For example, in addressing Indicator 4, Academic Proficiency, the applicant includes such quantitative data as attendance reports, assessment data, risk factor data, number of hours and types of services, and other information (page 54). Qualitative data includes logs of students referred for services, student focus groups, student interviews, teacher interviews, and student observations. The applicant supports these activities with an appropriate timeline for completion and distribution (page 59). The proposed evaluation activities provide appropriate objective performance measures to assess progress.

The project is based on a strong theoretical framework which is described in the enclosed logic model (page 86). The model includes a description of the needs to be addressed and how the solutions ranging from birth to career will address those needs. The model is consistent with the project design which focuses on such areas as early learning and development, Promise Schools, family and school coordination, and wellness and safety. The model includes short-term and long-term goals that are consistent with the design. As a result, the design is based on a sound theoretical foundation.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

**Reader's Score: 30**

### **Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Services**

- 1. The likelihood that the services to be provided by the proposed project will lead to improvement in the achievement of students as measured against rigorous academic standards.**

**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.**

**Suggested Point Ranges: Not Addressed: 0; Poorly Developed: 1-6; Adequately Developed: 7-13; Strongly Developed: 14-19; Fully Developed: 20**

**General:**

Strengths:

The applicant describes how it will develop its project services to ensure high levels of student achievement. Programs are based on standards that focus on aspirations, rigor, expectations, accountability, and sustainability (pages 61-62). In identifying the standards, the applicant indicates a specific outcome relative to each of the standards. For accountability, it notes that it seeks to develop schools that make decisions about student readiness and school improvement using data to create a complete profile and to gauge progress over time. To support the standards, the applicant indicates that it will ensure that all schools in the Promise Neighborhood will be accredited (page 63), that schools will use databased decision-making, establish career readiness targets and benchmarks, create an early warning system to improve graduation, and to increase access to rigorous and engaging coursework. The standards represent a rigorous foundation for the program.

The applicant describes a long history of establishing working partnerships with other organizations to serve its students. Specifically, for this project, the applicant has focused on forming partnerships that are committed to a theory of change, includes specific financial support for each entity, accountability requirements, and a governance structure to support all partners (page 95). In addition to the eight formal partners, the applicant has 39 informal partners who have committed support to the project. Included in the information are specific goals and accountability processes for each of the partners.

The applicant has created an effective partnership program.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

**Reader's Score: 20**

### **Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan**

- 1. Working with the neighborhood and its residents; the schools; the LEA in which those schools are located; Federal, State, and local government leaders; and other service providers.**

**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.**

**Suggested Point Ranges: Not Addressed: 0; Poorly Developed: 1-6; Adequately Developed: 7-13; Strongly Developed: 14-19; Fully Developed: 20**

**General:**

Strengths:

The management plan provided includes a description of its management team that possesses the appropriate background and experience to conduct the project (pages 72-73). Included in the plan is the establishment of a Management Board which is comprised of the applicant as well as members of the various partners (page 74). Also included are representatives from childcare providers, community and faith based organizations, and providers serving the Promise Neighborhood. Also included will be a Family Advisory Council which will have representation on the Management Board. In addition to an extended description of the applicant's experience in working with local, state, federal government and community organizations, the applicant provides a description of its proposed approaches to build capacity for ongoing improvement (page 80). The management plan described by the applicant will ensure an efficient and effective working relationship with the project stakeholders.

The applicant provides a plan to collect, analyze, and use data in making decisions concerning the project. Based on experience with other projects and work in the community, the applicant has initiated a tracking process of current students in various programs such as GEAR UP (page 81). It will initiate a new customized, web-based portal that will collect and organize data from multiple systems from local, state and national databases. Included are systems conducted by the Kentucky Department of Education and the National Student Clearinghouse (page 82). The applicant indicates that it will ensure the privacy of students in its processing of information and data. In addition to having access to such data, the applicant indicates it will work with a national evaluator who will supervise all activities and requirements associated with the project (page 85).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

**Reader's Score: 20**

### **Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources**

**1. The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the number of persons to be served and to the anticipated results and benefits.**

The extent to which the applicant demonstrates that it has the resources to operate the project beyond the length of the grant, including a multi-year financial and operating model and accompanying plan; the demonstrated commitment of any partners; evidence of broad support from stakeholders (e.g., LEAs, city government, other nonprofits) critical to the project's long-term success; or more than one of these types of evidence.

**Suggested Point Ranges: Not Addressed: 0; Poorly Developed: 1-5; Adequately Developed: 6-10; Strongly Developed: 11-14; Fully Developed: 15**

**General:**

Strengths:

The applicant indicates that its projected costs are reasonable in terms of its plan to provide direct services to 10,347 children and youth and their families in the target area (page 86). The cost on a per child basis is approximately \$580. The applicant is requesting an annual federal budget of \$6 million and is supported by \$3 million of non-federal funds (pages e7-e8). Included in the budget are line item allocations for personnel, fringe benefits, travel, supplies, and contractual services. The allocations appear reasonable in terms of anticipated results and benefits.

The applicant indicates that it will ensure sustainability of the project activities after the grant ends by establishing a college endowment which will include continued work for Promise Neighborhood programs (page 88). In addition, it will continue to seek additional funding for the project, collaborate with the local school district and partners in order to integrate activities with ongoing programs, and cultivate additional community partnerships. These activities will be supported through strong evaluation activities to illustrate the value of continuing or expanding the various programs. These activities will form the basis of a multiyear financial operating model to identify sources of future funding (page 91). These activities will enhance the sustainability of the proposed program.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

**Reader's Score: 15**

**Priority Questions**

**Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority**

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 1**

**0 or 2 Points**

**Improving Early Learning Development and Outcomes**

**Projects that are designed to improve early learning and development outcomes across one or more of the essential domains of school readiness (as defined in this notice) for children from birth through third grade (or for any age group within this range) through a focus on improving the coordination and alignment among early learning and development systems and between such systems and elementary education systems, including coordination and alignment in engaging and supporting families and improving transitions for children along the birth-through-third grade continuum, in accordance with applicable privacy laws.**

**General:**

Strengths:

The applicant indicates that the proposed activities will greatly expand its existing network of early learning providers and

will ensure high quality programming which will result in school readiness (page 91). Building on the work of the Promise Neighborhood Early Learning Team, the proposed programs will facilitate enrollment in the state wide All Stars program which will support access to evidence-based early learning curriculum and instructional practices. The project will partner with other organizations in assisting early childhood practitioners with professional development services. The desired result is a seamless system of services and support for children from birth to career (page 93).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

**Reader's Score: 2**

**2. Competitive Preference Priority 2**

**0 or 2 Points**

**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 FY 2009 or later years. To be eligible under this priority, the applicant must either: (1) be able to demonstrate that it has received a Choice Neighborhoods or HOPE VI grant; or (2) provide, in its application, a memorandum of understanding between it and a partner that is a recipient of a Choice Neighborhoods or HOPE VI grant. The memorandum must indicate a commitment on the part of the applicant and partner to coordinate implementation and align resources to the greatest extent practicable.

**General:**

Applicant does not address this priority.

**Reader's Score: 0**

**3. Competitive Preference Priority 3**

**0 or 2 Points**

**Promise Zones**

This priority is for projects that are designed to serve and coordinate with a federally designated Promise Zone.

**General:**

Strengths:

The proposed program is located in the only federally designated rural Promise Zone, the Southeastern Kentucky Promise Zone (page 95).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

**Reader's Score: 2**

**4. Competitive Preference Priority 4  
0 or 2 Points**

**High School and Transition to College**

**Increasing the number and proportion of high-need students who are academically prepared for, enroll in, or complete on time college, other postsecondary education, or other career and technical education.**

**General:**

Strengths:

The applicant addresses this priority through a series of strategies that focuses on providing services to promote college and postsecondary matching, summer mentoring and bridge program, and connections to on-campus resources and advocates. The proposed activities include project staff, volunteers, and partners working with students to prepare them for the college admission and selection process (page 96). To academically and socially support the students, the applicant will conduct a summer bridge program which will include mentoring, peer support, extra academic support, and other intensive assistance to prepare the students for college (page 98). These activities will be further supplemented through the identification of individuals who will assist the students both in and out of the classroom to navigate the college admission, selection, and attendance process (page 99).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

**Reader's Score: 2**

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 10/18/2016 07:40 AM