

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 10/19/2016 12:47 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Delta Health Alliance, Inc. (U215N160028)

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	0
4. Priority	2	2
<b>Sub Total</b>	8	4
<b>Total</b>	108	104

# Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - Panel - 2: 84.215N

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

Applicant: Delta Health Alliance, Inc. (U215N160028)

## 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 does an excellent job of describing the severity of the problems in the targeted area of the Mississippi Delta. Overall the area is found to be one the poorest and most disadvantaged areas in the U.S. (page e33) For example, there is a lack of access to appropriate services, high rates of chronic disease and other negative health outcomes, poor academic performance, systemic discrimination and intergenerational poverty. The two school districts to be served meet low-income poverty requirements, receive Title I funding, and are RLIS eligible. (page e34) Education need indicators demonstrates that all five targeted schools are considered low-performing according to the state and the definitions provided in the Promise Neighborhood notice. Other significant indicators are identified by an effective needs assessment and segmentation analysis. They include such factors as low graduation rates, low college readiness rates, low early childhood readiness and others. (pages e35-e48)

Weaknesses: No weaknesses noted.

Strengths: The applicant clearly describes the geographically defined area. For example, the proposed program will serve five schools in two public school districts covering 17 rural counties of the Mississippi Delta in northwest Mississippi, which is one of the historically poorest, underserved regions of the United States. The targeted area has a total population of 10,476 individuals and has persistent poverty, unemployment, crime and poor health outcomes. (page e26)

Weaknesses: No weaknesses noted.

Strengths: The applicant provides a very strong and detailed description of significant gaps or weaknesses in services, infrastructure, or opportunities for the targeted area. (pages e56-e58) Specific baseline data is provided to guide the program. (page e50-e53) In addition, the proposed program clearly describes how identified needs will be addressed with a comprehensive support system. The project will transform the target area ecosystem and create effective and sustainable improvements to address key shortages and weaknesses in services, infrastructure and opportunities. (page e56)

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 proposed program clearly describes a complete and effective continuum of solutions, including early learning through grade 12, college- and career-readiness, and family and community supports. (pages e81-e88) This includes the use of a data system that creates a comprehensive “digital passport” that follows students from birth through each school and even beyond high school graduation. (page e81) There are thirty-three interconnected initiatives that comprise the program’s Continuum of Solutions. All of the solutions are based on empirical evidence, best practices, and first-hand experience of implementing Promise Neighborhoods in Sunflower County, Mississippi. The applicant provides a visual map of the Continuum of Solutions. (page e87-e88)

**Weaknesses:** No weaknesses noted.

**Strengths:** The applicant clearly demonstrates that The proposed program is based on the best available evidence. For example, the project will rely on the Promise Neighborhoods’ model of using community-driven, place-based efforts to improve educational and developmental outcomes for children. (page e148) In addition, the program activities will draw from other successful models such as the Indianola Promise Community and The Harlem Children’s Zone. Strong evidence of success is provided to support each one of the program’s thirty-three initiatives.

**Weaknesses:** No weaknesses noted.

**Strengths:** The applicant clearly identifies strong coordination and leverage funding from existing assets and programs. Programs funded by Federal, State, local, and private funds will coordinate with this grant to implement a continuum of solutions. These programs range from local Head Start programs to school-based programs to colleges that serve the area. Program resources include referral agreements, dual enrollment programs, data sharing, collaborative training and joint events. (pages e136-e139)

**Strengths:** The evaluation plan is very comprehensive and will effectively provide for project quantitative and qualitative data. The applicant will collect performance data on 33 indicators/programs and 15 community partners, using a universal case management data system. Each indicator will have its own set of performance measures that will measure quantity, quality and impact on program participants. Indicator data will be collected and reported annually but goals and performance measure data at the program-level will be collected on a monthly basis in order to adjust strategies in a timely manner. (pages e140-e146)

**Weaknesses:** No weaknesses noted.

**Strengths:** The applicant clearly demonstrates that the proposed program is supported by strong theory. The proposed project is built on the theory that the right combination of community and school inputs can yield positive academic, health and life outcomes. This results in children who can succeed because they have consistent, seamless access to the resources they need in and out of school. (page e149) A detailed Logic Model is included in Appendix G. The model

demonstrates a strong evidence-based project.

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 proposed project details 33 programs/initiatives that are all designed to effectively improve achievement through enhanced educational opportunities. Each one of the initiatives is connected to one or more GPRA metrics, which has a direct effect on the stated goals of the project. (page e152) For example, goal two is to achieve student proficiency in core subjects and there are evidence-based programs in place to support this goal (i.e., SPARK, LINKS, DCPN Literacy Fellows program, CARES Mentoring and others). (pages e152-e157) The initiatives target student achievement at different stages in the life course. (page e156)

**Weaknesses:** No weaknesses noted.

**Strengths:** The applicant clearly demonstrates a strong shared vision between formal and informal partners. Partners come from schools, financial institutions, municipalities, faith-based organizations, workforce development, law enforcement, families, child care centers, housing agencies, clinical settings, and other nonprofits. (page e164) The applicant has an effective method for holding partners accountable for performance as demonstrated by a flow chart on page e166. A signed MOU clearly outlines the roles of all partners. (pages e400-409)

**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 an effective governance structure that is governed by an experienced five-member board. The mission of the Board is to effectively improve the health and education of the men, women, and children of the target area. (pages e167-e169) The proposed project has a comprehensive and detailed plan to collaborate with the targeted neighborhood, residents; schools; the LEA where schools are located; Federal, State, and local government leaders; and other service providers. A Neighborhood Advisory Group is the result of the collaboration. (pages e182-e193)

Weaknesses: No weaknesses noted.

Strengths: The proposed project has a comprehensive management plan that utilizes Results-Based Accountability as a framework for implementation of programs and strategies. The program uses the tools from this framework for collecting, analyzing, and using data for decision-making, learning, continuous improvement, and accountability. (page e194) In addition, the program utilizes Social Solutions' Efforts to Outcomes as an organization-wide longitudinal database for all internal and external partner programs. (page e196) The database software is HIPAA compliant and equipped with appropriate security measures. (page e198)

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 costs for the proposed program was developed to make the best use of existing personnel, materials, infrastructure, and systems already in place, as well as leveraging all assets. The five-year cost for 12,517 projected participants will be \$673.72. The applicant clearly demonstrates that this cost is a positive investment across the target area. (page e201)

Weaknesses: No weaknesses noted.

Strengths: The applicant clearly demonstrates vast experience in administering funds from multiple federal granting agencies, private funding agencies, state contracts, and projects that generate program income (50 projects and \$200 million). (pages e206-207) The proposal has a multi-year financial and operating mode. This model demonstrates integration of funding streams from federal, state and private sources, which will support ongoing effective services (page e211). In addition, to the applicant's tangible resources, the Memoranda of Understanding for this program provides evidence of substantial commitments of resources and expertise from 40 project partners (i.e., universities, government departments, community led organizations, school administrators, out of school providers, childcare centers, churches, city officials and residents). (page e212)

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 applicant clearly demonstrates that the proposed program will meet Competitive Preference Priority 1 to improve early learning and development outcomes for children from birth through third grade. For example, the program will: 1) improve coordination and alignment among early learning and development systems and service providers; 2) foster and sustain connections between early learning / development systems and elementary education in the targeted School Districts; 3) improve transitions for children along the birth-third grade continuum; and 4) improve early learning and development outcomes across multiple domains of school readiness (including language and literacy development). (pages e213-e221) Appendix G provides evidence of success for the programs that will address those needs. (page e215)

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: The applicant does not address this competitive 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: No strengths noted.

Weaknesses: The applicant does not address this competitive priority.

**Reader's Score:** 0

**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 proposed program has a strong focus on post-secondary education and career development. (page e221) For example, comprehensive college and career readiness activities start very early in the program with a strong alignment of services. Students as young as seventh grade will start building individual college pathway portfolios. In addition they will expand their knowledge and interests in preferred college entrance requirements, necessary exam scores, financial aid opportunities, campus life activities, degree programs, yearly cost of attendance, and various other details of importance. (page e223) Another program, LINKS will provide a consistent, seamless support system to families to help students succeed. (page e226)

Weaknesses: No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score:** 2

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 10/19/2016 12:47 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 10/20/2016 12:58 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Delta Health Alliance, Inc. (U215N160028)

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	20
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	20	19
<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	0
4. Priority	2	2
<b>Sub Total</b>	8	4
<b>Total</b>	108	103

# Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - Panel - 2: 84.215N

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

Applicant: Delta Health Alliance, Inc. (U215N160028)

## 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 Deer Creek PN proposal provided very strong evidence of need in the Mississippi Delta, identifying that an astronomical number of children (50%) are living in poverty (page e26). It also provided strong evidence of partners experience working in the area.

The DCPN proposal defined a very specific area to be served, identifying population of 10,476 individuals, and including 2 school districts, receiving Title 1 funding and eligible for Rural and Los Income Schools (RLIS) programs.

The DCPN proposal identified gaps and service weaknesses, etc., through a collective process with key stakeholders, qualitative and quantitative research. Significant challenges were identified by the 2016 needs assessment and segmentation analysis. Through this process, consensus on DCPN goals addressing has been achieved. The applicant demonstrated clear understanding of Dear Creek conditions, assets and needs, and engagement with the community.

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: Solid implementation plan based on applicant's previous experience with development and implementation of Indianola PN program in Sunflower County. Design included participation of community stakeholders and takes into consideration the needs and challenges of children living in intergenerational poverty.

The applicant has presented solutions, based on lessons learned from prior PN implementation, and qualitative and quantitative research conducted during the DCPN planning process. Models like Trauma-Informed Community Building and programs like LINKS, STAR Academy, key implementation tools, are all evidence-based. Additionally, applicant has conducted LINKS outside evaluation, demonstrating successful results. Very well researched plan.

The applicant has identified an impressive number of community partners, and will continue to collaborate with organizations that have participated in the IPN, including Children's Defense Fund and Save the Children, both strong and reputable organizations. The application clearly delineates what program/s each partner will implement and how each will be held accountable. It is evident that DHA has deep relationships in the area, and has worked with private and government leaders in support of communities in the region.

Applicant presented detailed and clear goals and objectives, related to intended outcomes. These were not only based on past IPN successes, but also on Deer Creek context. The methods of evaluation, including tools like ETO, are well defined and appropriate for the project. Short, Intermediate and long term results are tied well developed and in adequate order and time.

The proposed project is based on a strong theory of change, supported by appropriate goals and objectives. These seem to have been developed in collaboration with all 25 active partners.

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: Applicant proposes a continuum of services/program pre-natal to age 24. DHA has demonstrated prior successful experience with IPN, and has expertise in coordinating large multi-sectorial projects. The DCPN partners have developed a strong continuum of evidence-based programs to support its theory of change and action. The likelihood that the services will lead to improvement in the achievement of students is great.

Applicant presented strong partnerships and detailed planning process, which achieved consensus on vision, theory of change and action (goals and objectives). The fact that a number of IPN partners will be collaborating on DCPN is a testament of the quality and strength of these relationships. The mechanisms for accountability described in the proposal seem appropriate and workable.

Weaknesses: None identified.

**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: It is clear that DHA has deep connections and relationships in the region. Applicant has demonstrated that it has experience and expertise in working with schools, Federal, State and local government and has extensive relationships with nonprofits.

Data collection infrastructure already developed for IPN. The applicant has developed appropriate plan for new DCPN project, and has experience with implementation.

Weaknesses: Applicant did not address how it will work with community-based organizations to increase their capacity to collect and analyze data.

**Reader's Score: 19**

### **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:**

Proposed costs are reasonable in relation to project size and scope.

Strengths: Applicant has experience and expertise in working with foundations and government to finance and support

projects. It is clear that support for DCPN will allow for the development and implementation of systems to supporting student achievement after the PN grant program is over.

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: The applicant has prior successful experience and expertise in implementing successful program to improve early learning and development outcomes for children birth through 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 proposal.

**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:**

Not applicable to this proposal

**Reader's Score: 0**

**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: Applicant has demonstrated creative and systematic ways to support programs and services for children and families through partnerships with private foundations and government funds. The proposed project will increase 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.

Weaknesses: None identified.

**Reader's Score: 2**

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 10/20/2016 12:58 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 10/20/2016 10:43 AM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Delta Health Alliance, Inc. (U215N160028)

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	0
4. Priority	2	2
<b>Sub Total</b>	8	4
<b>Total</b>	108	104

# Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - Panel - 2: 84.215N

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

Applicant: Delta Health Alliance, Inc. (U215N160028)

## 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, located in the State of Mississippi, proposes to provide services designed to improve school readiness, academic achievement, and career or college preparation to participants in a rural school district that is predominantly African-American. Based on the results of the activities conducted by the Promise Neighborhood planning coalition, the applicant indicates that it is focusing on one of the poorest and most disadvantaged areas in United States (page 10). Using data and information from assessments, interviews, and focus groups, the applicant concentrated attention in examining educational needs (page 13) as well as family and community (page 19). For each of the concentrations, the applicant provides education and health statistics to support the identified needs such as segregation in public schools, low educational attainment and graduation rates, low college readiness scores, and low early childhood readiness, and low parental involvement. For example, the applicant cites a survey report indicating that only 52.3% parents have visited their child's classroom (page 17). In terms of family and community, the applicant notes such needs as persistent poverty, single-parent homes, access to quality early childcare centers, and high teen pregnancy. The applicant reports that the state had the third highest teen birth rate in the United States in 2014 (page 21). Based on these needs, the applicant has developed nine goals to address the specific needs (pages 28-31). The statement of needs is clear and documents the strong need.

Using both maps and narrative, the applicant clearly identifies the geographic area served. The area is in the heart of the Mississippi Delta and includes 10,476 residents (page 31). In addition to its high poverty, the area also experiences heavy flooding and economic upheaval.

The applicant has identified 12 gaps or weaknesses that will be addressed by the project (pages 34-36). For each gap or weakness, the applicant describes the level of magnitude and supports the opportunity with information on how the project will address the gap. For example, one gap identifies its teacher development. The applicant indicates that only half of the teachers felt they had self efficacy in terms of school policy and only 40% felt they had input to professional development. The applicant comments that as a result teachers and low performing schools lack a sense of self-efficacy and the empowered participation in professional development (page 35). The applicant is focusing on responsible activities identified effectively as gaps or weaknesses in services.

##### 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 design of the program provided by the applicant includes 33 initiatives which focus on schools, family and community as indicated in the need statement. For each of the initiatives, the applicant describes the model it intends to initiate and how that process will generally be implemented. To support the interrelationship of the programs, the applicant provides a visual map illustrating how the programs work alongside of each other or blend together (page 66). Programs range from focusing on pregnancy, parents as teachers, books and literacy, pre-K outreach and instruction, and early head start programs to mentoring programs, after-school tutoring, summer camps, and teacher coaching and development programs. For each of these proposed initiatives, the applicant provides background information on the model, target enrollments, participants, and measures for assessment. For example, for the Teacher Coaching and Development program, the applicant identifies teachers and administrators who will be participants, provides enrollment levels of 25 for each year, and intends to use reading levels and graduation rates as measurement instruments (page 83). The information provided by the applicant is detailed and comprehensive and will provide the complete continuum of programs for the target area.

The applicant provides extensive research support for the proposed programs in terms of research studies and evidence of best practice. For example, for the proposed Childcare Quality Initiative, the applicant will employ the state Low Income Child Care Initiative which meets the evidence standards of the What Works Clearinghouse (page 72). In the overall design of the program, the applicant cites numerous research to support its focus on poverty, early childhood programs, improving grade level reading, and strengthen transition rates from middle to high school. For example, the applicant cites seven relevant research based articles supporting its focus on obstacles being faced by children living in poverty (page 41). These supporting materials provide a base of strong or moderate evidence for the program.

The applicant includes a substantial listing and description of various existing neighborhood agencies or organizations providing services to the community and school. The information is specific in terms of the type of program, participants

being served, and the anticipated outcomes of program (pages 114-117). Programs are focused on early childhood development, K-12 school, college preparation, workforce development, and community health. For example, the applicant indicates a local power company provides financial assistance to adults in the community and assists them in dealing with loans and capital access for minority applicants (page 117). Another asset identified by the applicant is the robotics program at a junior high school which brings competitive teams of 10 students to annual competitions across the state (page 115). These local organizations will assist the project in creating a continuum of programs for the project participants.

The applicant describes an evaluation plan that will focus on the 33 programs and 15 community partners using case management data (page 118). The plan will collect and analyze both qualitative and quantitative data, focused on the project and using GPRA indicators. The plan is supported by a map of the continuum services which relates the GPRA indicators with the proposed activities and services and the overall goals of the project (page 120). For example, the eight program initiatives focusing on college preparation address the GPRA indicators that focus on the number and percent of students who attain a college degree or complete a program and related directly to Goal 5 of the program. These relationships as well as the specific performance objectives will produce sufficient data to assess the success of the project.

In addition to the research and best practices identified in the description of the various initiatives, the applicant also provides a logic model which illustrates the relationship between the various components of the project (page e452). The logic model includes a description of the proposed transformative outcomes and provides specific short-term results, intermediate results, and long-term results. Included also are the various inputs that are directly related to the proposed solution plan. In addition, the applicant has gained a great deal from a careful review and consideration of the programs, policies, and management practices from the Indianola Promise Community (page 126). The logic model, together with the research information, provides a strong foundation for the program.

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 indicates that the proposed 33 program initiatives are based on the goals of the project which are aligned to one or more of the GPRA measures (page 130). Each of the goals reflects responsible outcomes and is based on standards established in the various professions. The applicant describes its various programs and aligns them with positive issues associated with high standards and rigorous programs. For example, in describing the early childhood education approach, the applicant is committed to the goals that implement high quality standards across the state, a revision of the state quality improvement system, professional training, a statewide kindergarten readiness assessment, community engagement, and the implementation of a statewide early childhood data system (page 137). These activities support an effort to seek improvement based on rigorous academic standards.

The applicant presents a plan that includes both short-term and long-term results that will result in improvement in academic, health, and economic gains for students, parents, and families. These activities are based on the ability to involve and support partnerships that will assist in providing funding, new partners, research, and technical assistance (page 142). The applicant provides a list of current partners who are actively participating in the project. They include a wide range of organizations from financial institutions to childcare centers. Included also are schools and other educational programs. To assist in the management of their activities, the applicant presents a Program Accountability Flow Chart which describes how information will be shared and how partners will be involved in the activities of the project (page 144).

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 applicant describes its management plan and the various sub-organizations that will assist in meeting its mission to improve the health and education of the men, women, and children that make the Mississippi Delta their home (page 147). Included in the structure is the development of a parent committee that will be organized and run by parents. In addition, the plan includes an Accountability Committee that will focus on the areas of early childhood, academic K-12, college and career, and community. The applicant describes each of the teams, relates them to the GPRA indicators, identifies participants, and explains their duties. These intervention teams will focus on their particular area and outcomes related to the overall project. For example, the early childhood team will focus on GPRA indicators one through three (page 153). The management plan clearly indicates involvement of the neighborhood, residents, schools, and other stakeholders of the project.

The applicant describes how it will seek improvement through an accountability structure that uses data based decision-making. Included in the process are activities to address performance accountability, population level accountability, and staff accountability that will build a capacity to use data and employ it to make decisions (page 174). The data system includes measures of easy accessibility while still protecting individuals and organizations in terms of confidentiality (page 176). The three level security system is described in detail and indicates the project is abiding by privacy laws and requirements (page 177).

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 is requesting an initial budget of \$5,999,900 for year one of the project (page e312). The applicant will provide matching funds of \$3,395,595 of which 10.36% are from private sources. The applicant provides a detailed budget narrative which includes allocations for personnel, fringe benefits, supplies, and contractual services. The information provided is detailed and is also allocated according to the program initiatives being proposed by the applicant.

The applicant indicates that its long history in the community and its various relationships with partners throughout the target area will enable it to have its programs easily transferable to the operating budgets (page 187). In addition, the applicant indicates it will pursue funding sources from private foundations, individuals, corporations, state sources, and the federal government. Its success in doing so is illustrated by a number of grants it has received from such organizations as the Kellogg foundation.

##### 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 describes its extensive experience in working with current early childhood program providers throughout the target area. In addition, the applicant will seek to increase the coordination of the various programs as well as improve outcomes. The Early Childhood Team developed by the project will initiate efforts resulting in sharing information about resources, engaging in conversations leading to alignment, and identifying new approaches toward kindergarten ready alignment and joint accountability (page 195). Using data generated by the project and other sources, the team will work with local providers in examining data and focusing resources.

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:**

The 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:**

The applicant does not address this priority.

**Reader's Score: 0**

**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 indicates that it will increase the number and proportion of high need students who are academically prepared for, enrolled in, or complete college on time, other postsecondary education, or other career and technical education (page 199). To accomplish this end, the applicant plans to develop a range of activities as well as coordinate current levels of activities. For example, the availability of college prep classes is limited and needs to be expanded. The project will establish connections with other institutions including colleges and universities to expand the pathway through the use of portfolios, exams, financial applications, and other activities (page 201). One approach to this effort will be the coordination with a local community college to provide additional services in these areas.

#### Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

**Reader's Score: 2**

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 10/20/2016 10:43 AM