

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 10/20/2016 01:07 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Drexel University (U215N160055)

Reader #1: *****

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

Technical Review Form

Panel #4 - Panel - 5: 84.215N

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Drexel University (U215N160055)

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: Table A located on page 9 of the grant application outlines the needs assessment and gap analysis. Seven indicators of need (Early Childhood, Academic, Community and Health, Crime and Violence, Family Stress, Poverty and Unemployment, and Trauma/Adverse Childhood Experiences) are identified through current Philadelphia cited research conducted by the Drexel, the Urban ACE Survey, and the Urban Institute. Compelling evidence within the table includes: Children within the community demonstrate low pre-literacy levels and score lower than 69% of comparable children outside the neighborhood. This early childhood indicator can be a contributing factor to later academic concerns. It is evident that the applicant would want to work effortlessly to assist early learners with literacy prior to formal kindergarten education. Within the community it is notated that during the 2012-2013 school year the turn overrate for new teachers reached 40%. Also a major concern within the community at West Philadelphia High School was that only 30% of students and 67% of teachers typically attend 95% of instructional days. If students are not consistently attending school, they are unable to complete assignments and meet proficiency expectations. Outlined in the grant application is a need to address high crime rates due to the fact that Philadelphia is the most violent of the 11 largest counties in the U.S. The detailed gap analysis located on pages 12-15 provides information on 12 identified gaps, the effects gaps have on students and families within the community. The applicant has also provided key information on how gaps will be addressed.

The applicant has thoroughly described in the narrative that the area is a Promise Zone community. Drexel is seeking funding to support the Mantua, Powelton Village, West Powelton, Belmont, Mill Creek, and East Parkside neighborhoods. It is understood that this is an area of high poverty, high crime, and high violence rates. The geographic area will also include 7 census tract communities where the majority are populated with minority residents where over 53% live in poverty. On page 37 of the grant application there is documentation that census tract 90 serves as an outlier because the area is located near the university and economic and educational statistics do not match the other six tracts.

Strengths: The applicant has done a good job describing the magnitude of the gaps and weaknesses. The detailed gap analysis located on pages 12-15 provides information on 12 identified gaps and the effects gaps have on students and families within the community. The applicant has also provided key information on how gaps will be addressed. For example, it is sound that the applicant will create a partnership with the City's Early Childhood Education Initiative to inform residents on the benefits to early childhood education. Drexel's plan to not only provide early learning academic support but to also support students approaching graduation by providing mentorship programs, internship placement and job training programs, and workshops exploring topics to prepare students for college is well documented and will support

addressing the weakness of services within the neighborhoods. Addressing gaps to ensure health care services are accessible and plans to create and implement a shared data system where residents will have access to services and information within the community are well described. Also, plans to address health concerns and economic disparities, demonstrates a clear understanding of the barriers within the community and the importance of immediate service delivery.

There are no weaknesses indicated.

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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: On page 39 of the grant application is an ambitious desire to partner with 100 organizations and service agencies, anchor institutions, educational providers, governmental department, private donors, and philanthropic entities. The ability to attract a wealth of partners demonstrates an understanding that stakeholders are willing to take a community effort to support change within the promise zone.

Strengths: Plans are written to reform the schools using a turnaround model by placing effective leaders in schools, providing high quality instruction, creating opportunities for teacher collaboration, creating safe and orderly learning environments, and encouraging strong family and community ties. Attachment 7 located in the appendix provides evidence that the applicant desires to improve on previous attempts that occurred during 2002-2005 and 2010-2011 to support learning. The rationale for change is supported by research and the timeline for implementation is realistic. The applicants planned outcomes after implementation can be achieved with grant funding.

Strengths: The applicant has done a good job of describing existing investments and demonstrated success with early learning centers and K-12 educational reform. The early learning desire to streamline training, increase recruitment efforts, provide workforce development to increase opportunities for teachers that apply for credential, and increase Pre-K registration within the Promise Zone are all realistic efforts to serve the significant portion of early learners over time. Also, the expected transformation outputs listed on page 50 will lead to greater success when students transition from Pre-K to elementary school. K-12 demonstrated outcomes information included on pages 53-55 show significant improvement in achievement data using Response to Intervention (RtI) and Positive Behavior Intervention Support (PBIS) models. Utilizing a Compassionate Engagement model to keep students engage using systemic supports and targeted 3 full day

monthly trainings is additional pieces of evidence that the applicant is dedicated to improving learning outcomes of students. It is believable that these desired goals can lead to positive academic improvements to all students in the Promise Zone.

Strengths: A comprehensive effort to reach all students as they transition out of high school is understood. Innovative ideas to create learning opportunities for nontraditional students with the design of Multiple Pathways programs can lead to increased student achievement. Plans to provide College and Career Readiness Programs, summer learning support, out of school time and experiential learning programs, and mental health services to students will also lead to student success.

Strengths: On page 78 are 20 performances measures that are listed to provide family and community support. All students within the Promise Zone will benefit by implementing both academic reforms and engaging families and community goals. The applicants list is extensive and covers efforts to create programs that foster positive healthy living for all members of the family.

Strengths: The applicant's attachment 9 covers 11 research based studies that are linked to the goals and programs that will be implemented with grant funding. The applicant has done a good job of locating current research on the following topics:

- Early childhood intervention and reform
- Improving academic achievement in math
- Individual student intervention through RTI implementation
- I-learning models
- Communities in Schools model
- Youth re-engagement centers
- School-to-work transitions
- Teacher training an effectiveness
- Compassionate Schools model
- Counseling
- Family engagement

Strengths: The applicant project goals demonstrates a commitment to reform efforts. The applicant has done an excellent job of including citations of research and explaining how the research is relevant to the goals within the grant application.

Strengths: An exhaustive list of key partners and existing community assets has been provided on pages 80 and 81 in addition to being located within the logic model. Expressed on pages e259-e271 is evidence of funding from the Urban Health Care Collaborative, Jeffrey Beachell, Lenfest Foundation, Patricia Kind Foundation, the Drexel School of Education, the William Penn Foundation, and Patricia Imbesi. The applicant has also appropriately described federal and non-federal dollars with collaborating agencies.

Strengths: Benchmarks for each year of grant funding is include in the applicant's project. Plans to hire an external evaluator that validate performance measures quarterly are sound. Drexel has a plan to collect both qualitative and quantitative data. It is listed on pages 87 and 88 that Drexel will collect information from formal reports and neighborhood surveys. The grant applicant has done a good job of indicating that results from the project will be disseminated annually at school and community briefs in infographic-heavy formats. Plans to evaluate the progress of leveraging resources to sustain the initiative beyond the years of funding are included in the grant application.

Strengths: This application is designed with the Collective Impact Approach model. With over 100 partners identified, it is believable that the community will work collectively to reform the areas of weaknesses addressed in the grant application. Within the appendix is a well-designed logic model that is aligned to current research.

There are no weaknesses indicated.

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: It is believable that the project, once fully implemented, will lead to academic success. The applicant has done a good job of providing evidence on how it will reform each aspect of student learning. The plan to include RTI and PBIS efforts demonstrate an understanding that a one size fits all model will not benefit all students. Plans to provide nontraditional avenues to high school diploma attainment, GED attainment, and college and career readiness are all efforts that will also lead to academic improvement within the Promise Zone.

Strengths: The applicant indicates on page 92 that many of the proposed solutions have been piloted in focus schools demonstrating extraordinary promise to effectuate change. Included in the grant application is current data on demonstrated systems outcomes. It is commendable that Drexel as already had an 18% increase in the number of students enrolled in high quality centers and that over 2,139 hours of on the job follow-up coaching has been conducted.

Strengths: Pages 94-97 provides a list of formal partners with Mount Vernon Community Development Corporation, People's Emergency Center, Philadelphia LISC, Philadelphia Mayor's Office of Community Empowerment and Opportunity, the Choice Planning Grant, Make Your Mark!, Byrne Criminal Justice Innovation Grant, and Fair Future Strategy. Promise Zone designations all appropriately have linkages to the six community priorities. The memorandum of understanding located in the appendix addresses stakeholder accountability. With the wealth of partners listed, the applicant has demonstrated a commitment from multiple stakeholders to ensure that student achievement increases.

There are no weaknesses indicated.

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 noted on page 100 that members of the Education and Health and wellness teams have worked collaboratively for over five years. Deep working relationships supports the need to work together to put the needs of students and community first. Plans to provide academic support in addition to community and health awareness are

mentioned throughout the grant application. Also pages 94-97 and pages e259-e271 describe what role partners will have to ensure schools are successful. It is commendable that the applicant will work to fundraise over \$45 million dollars to create a new school building within the Promise Zone.

Strengths: It is listed that the Project Director will work collectively with a data collecting group composed of Drexel University staff, the school district, and community staff. Plans to integrate current systems and infuse new sources are data are well justified. The desire to have two co-directors for this initiative is logical and provides additional evidence that there is a commitment from all stakeholders to ensure success. Plans to provide monthly and quarterly reports demonstrates the importance of communicating with all stakeholders. All partners with an MOU have a written commitment in the grant application in agreeing to having a shared longitudinal data system. Described on pages 105-111 are the types of data and the databases that will be used to collect data. The applicant has done a good job of describing how all data will be collected, shared, integrated, and stored. For example, plans for key personnel to meet once a week to oversee the project are realistic to ensuring the project goals are carried out with fidelity.

There are no weaknesses indicated.

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 cost outlined in the grant application are reasonable. It is believable that Drexel has the supports to implement the project with grant funding. With over 100 partners and letters of support the applicant has successfully made collaboration to provide better services within the community a priority. Also, evidence of in-kind donations and outside financial support provide evidence that the entity can sustain program goals years beyond grant funding.

Strengths: On page 120-124 of the grant application is information of over \$76 million dollars in federal, state, local, and private monetary support. The applicant has done a good job of obtaining dollars from contributing partners to supplement and sustain the program.

There are no weaknesses indicated.

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: Expanding early learning is mentioned throughout the grant application. The applicant has done a good job of explaining how it will support the transitional stages of learning. Efforts to expand early learning, train staff, provide parent education, and coaching to both students and parents are addressed and will lead to student achievement.

There are no weaknesses indicated.

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: The applicant has appropriately noted that it is a recipient of a Choice Learning Grant and a HUD Choice planning grant. The MOU listed in the appendix list a commitment to align resources for the Mt. Vernon Manor. Information on a Home Purchasing Assistance Program is also included in the grant application.

There are no weaknesses indicated.

Reader's Score: 2

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 applicant has designed a project that it has stated is located within a federal Promise Zone. Evidence of need and statistics of high poverty all addressed throughout the grant application.

There are no weaknesses indicated.

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: West Philadelphia High School is a school that will receive support through project implementation. The school has high dropout rates (58%) and low graduation rates (54%). The applicant has successfully described programs for early warning prevention programs, GED attainment, and post-secondary counseling to support high school students.

There are no weaknesses indicated.

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 10/20/2016 01:07 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 10/28/2016 02:30 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Drexel University (U215N160055)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Need for Project		
1. Need	15	14
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	30
Quality of Project Services		
1. Project Services	20	20
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	20
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Adequacy of Resources	15	15
Sub Total	100	99
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority		
1. Priority	2	2
2. Priority	2	2
3. Priority	2	2
4. Priority	2	2
Sub Total	8	8
Total	108	107

Technical Review Form

Panel #4 - Panel - 5: 84.215N

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Drexel University (U215N160055)

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's use of resident-driven planning efforts helps to highlight which specific priorities are needed in the targeted neighborhood. (p.7) The poorest city in America (p.8) coupled with deep poverty issues that accompany this designation makes the point that the needs are severe. The charts on pages 9-11 outline specifically many of the needs including exposure to trauma/adverse childhood experiences.

Weaknesses: The applicant does not specifically state that a segmentation analysis was complete to ensure that all needs are outlined.

Strengths: The geographical area is outlined as the same area as the HUD Promise Zone and has detailed explanation in the West Philadelphia Promise Neighborhood Zone Geography- Target area (p. 36). This area has been described in detail including census data (p. 36)

Weaknesses: None noted

Strengths: The gaps are outlined in a gap analysis table on pages 12-15. These gaps have specific strategies that will address them outlined in this table. The model of school reform outlined will benefit principals and teachers and provide learning tools for the residents. The early childhood educational initiative will build capacity in centers that are preparing students for Kindergarten. Each point on the continuum will be supported including transition activities from 8th grade to high school and high school to college or the workplace (p. 13).

Weaknesses: None noted

Reader's Score: 14

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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 has been involved in five years of planning and two years of implementation as a designated Promise Zone (p. 39). The 100 organizations involved have created a Continuum of Services based on a Collective Impact Theory of Change (p.39). This reform initiative proposes to focus on early learning, K-12 reform, college and career readiness and family and community supports. It aligns nicely with the need provided earlier and has a thorough plan outlined including leveraging existing resources and creating mini-plans for each element (p.40). These areas are leverage points and the proposal has strong strategies that show how the project already under way can be strengthened to reach more students during the continuum when all pieces are in place. For example, the applicant outlines on page 46 that a comprehensive focus on early learning will be to expand the alliance already created between providers and to streamline trainings and services. The Turnaround Model described on p. 42 builds on five elements- effective leaders, high quality instruction, collaborative teachers, safe and orderly learning environments and strong family and community ties. These are backed by research and show a strong correlation with success. (research cited Torre, et al 2013)

Weaknesses: None noted

Strengths: Each of the areas of the proposed solutions such as early childhood, kindergarten readiness, K-12 education reform, college and career readiness and family and community supports have extensive research behind them as shown on pages 45 and 46. Attachment 9 shows the key areas and strong research to confirm they will address the areas of need. The emphasis of research-based strategies strengthens this overall design. For example, on page e413 Building knowledge, awareness and engagement among families about the importance of high-quality early childhood education and health has been proven to improve achievement of Kindergarten students. The K-12 educational reform, college and career readiness and family and community supports form together with early learning to create a strong, research based continuum.

Weaknesses: None noted

Strengths: The key partners and existing community assets including academic supports, school-based behavioral health services, child welfare supports, and positive parent programs as well as many others are nicely outlined in a table on pages 80-81 including partners such as Drexel's various departments, behavioral health services, city of Philadelphia office, grant networks family supports and community connectors. The applicant also outlines indirect contributors on page 81. This list of partners provides \$76,777,700.58 of matching funds. These funding streams are outlined in another section of the proposal on page 120.

Weaknesses: None noted

Strengths:

The performance indicators are listed in the previous section beginning on page 74 such as Increase access to appropriate healthcare and early intervention services. These are clear objective measures and provide outcomes that

will improve the outcomes of those in this zone. Appendix F outlines how the data will be tracked and this will provide quantitative and qualitative data to see if the project is hitting its benchmarks. The logic model (Appendix F) also helps to strengthen the correlation between the actions and the outcomes.

Weaknesses: None noted

Strengths: The Collective Impact Theory is clearly documented in Appendix F and the narrative on page 90. This impact theory strengthened by evidence cited in Attachment 9 is a strong rationale for the collective groups working together collaboratively to create a successful neighborhood. The outcomes listed are tied directly to the research base are likely to produce a successful project focusing in the areas of early learning, K-12 reform, college and career readiness as well as family supports.

Weaknesses: None 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 section "Building Upon Demonstrated Success" outlines how many of the initiatives are already working since there has been prior planning and implementation (p. 92). The schools in the initiative already have a strong partnership with Drexel and other partners (p. 92). The early successes described on page 51 show that the collective approach is yielding good results. The timeline for engagement illustrated on 95 as well as the approach of the partnerships outlined beginning on page 100. The Compassionate School Model professional development and the college and career awareness component (p.102) will likely help lead students to academic success. The University will be the organization providing the professional development and has been clearly outlined in this proposal as an educational leader.

Weaknesses: None noted

Strengths:

The organizational chart in Appendix B along with the MOUs outline that the theories of action and change of the partners aligns with the overall vision of the project. The organizational chart creates the system and shows how each component will be accountable for the success of the project. Each of the partners have listed their theory of change such as Belmont Charter School on page e265 states that it "believes that every child deserves a great school in their own community and ...a strong cradle to career pathway of academic support and a comprehensive community school model... will prepare each student to live a high quality life." Each partner outlines how its vision and theories of action align to the project.

Weaknesses: None 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 key personnel and partnerships that are proposed implementing the solutions are also explained in the Project Design component. For example, on page 52 Drexel SoE is shown to currently provide a full-time position, Assistant Director of K-12 School Work dedicated to serving as a liaison between the University and the schools (p. 52). These descriptions flesh out the chart into exactly what each partner and key personnel are doing to make the project successful. Partners are proposed to work in committees (p.101). The project proposes to work with the School District of Philadelphia (p. 102), Wordsorth, and the Office of University and Community Partnerships. There are ongoing projects with the Mayor's Office of Education (p. 102) and extensive planning coming from the Department of Labor and other federal, state, and local funding sources. (p. 102). The applicant has shown that these partnerships already exist and will provide adequate funding for project success and sustainability. Page 116 outlines the key committee members, their affiliation and their area of expertise. The accountability and compliance as outlined on page 119 highlights shared responsibilities and work plans.

Weaknesses: None noted

Strengths: The applicant goes into great detail about how data is currently being collected and how they have a proposed plan on building, adapting, and expanding a longitudinal data system. The proposal outlines how many sources of data already exist on pages 105- 110. The proposal to manage the data system by key personnel is outlined on page 110 and specific measures to ensure this data is collected and handled in an appropriate manner are clearly laid out.

Weaknesses: None 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 related are reasonable given the scope of the project and the number of persons to be served. Beginning on page e456 an extensive program is outlined that will have tremendous impact on large numbers of students. The benefit to this community of the grant is also matched by more than \$110 million in annual expenditures and \$9.4

million in-kind contributions over the term of the grant (p. 122). The project will significantly benefit the neighborhood proposed.

Weaknesses: None noted

Strengths: The partners are listed and resources are outlined that will lead to sustainability and long-term success.

Weaknesses: None 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:

The project addresses this competitive priority and outlines the creation of an alliance of childcare providers, citywide work, and enhancing coordination and communication of service providers. This is a strong proposal to meet the needs of the families in this neighborhood.

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 addresses this priority on pp. 34, 128, and 129. The MOU verifies this and is entitled: West Philadelphia Promised Neighborhood.

Reader's Score: 2

**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:

Philadelphia was designated as a Promise Zone.

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:

Coordinating basic education support and training requirements will help to raise the high school graduation and make the transition to college stronger.

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 10/28/2016 02:30 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 10/21/2016 11:51 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Drexel University (U215N160055)

Reader #3: *****

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

Technical Review Form

Panel #4 - Panel - 5: 84.215N

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Drexel University (U215N160055)

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 has employed a Needs Assessment and Segmentation Analysis to identify existing gaps in services such as high poverty, underperforming Pre K-12 schools, low educational attainment, and high unemployment. The applicant proposes to implement an education-focused cradle-to-college-and career approach to address the magnitude of the problems. The applicant stated that Philadelphia is the poorest big city in America (U.S. Census, 2014), (p.17,11,110,65)

Weaknesses: None Noted

Strength:

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

The applicant stated that the target area is located in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

The applicant described the Promise Zone residents as being 67% Black, 19% White, 8% of the residents are Asian and 3% Hispanic. The applicant stated that the zip code is 19104 and that there are 29,480 individuals living in Philadelphia Promise Zone. (p. 16,17,288, 102, Appendix)

Weaknesses: None Noted

Strengths:

The applicant has appropriately identified needs within their target community. They have noted disparities such as social, financial, economic, mobility, and transportation challenges that families encounter when seeking services. The applicant proposes to communicate with the community and serve residents in their own neighborhood. (p.12)

Weaknesses: None 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:

Within the Narrative, the applicant has stated relevant studies to validate the design of the program. The applicant has proposed to implement a comprehensive continuum of trauma-informed family and community support that is closely aligned with citywide education initiatives to address the cradle to college and career needs. The applicant has documented goals, strategies, monitoring progress plans, measurable objectives, benchmarks, as well as outcomes. The applicant has proposed sufficient resources, implementation plan, past success strategies, stakeholders' support, assessments, and strong theory that links the program inputs to the outcomes to reach scale over time. (p. 150,488, 74)

Weaknesses: None Noted

Strengths:

The applicant has referenced literature and described best available evidence in the Prosper Evidence Charts. They have noted citations, methods, and results of the study for key areas addressed in the proposal. (p.484)

Weaknesses: None Noted

Strengths:

The applicant details an array of services available in the proposal. For example, the applicant stated that partners such as CAB residents of the Promise Zone, Washington State University, the project director, and Drexel School of Public

Health will actively participate in implementing the proposed program. (p.140)

Weaknesses: None Noted

Strengths:

The applicant has provided an adequate plan for program evaluation. Their design for assessing the Promise Neighborhood interventions draws on principles of developmental evaluation. The approach is informed by evaluative and system thinking, data, and data-based reflection that provides regular feedback. The approach also informs decision making and implementation adaptations. The Logic Model described a set of evidence-based activities with measurable qualitative and quantitative outputs, short, medium, and long term outcomes. (p.113,136)

Weaknesses: None Noted

Strengths:

The applicant has provided a Logic Model that demonstrates resources, activities, outputs, short and medium term outcomes, and results. They have noted how research supports the design of their model. (p. 471)

Weaknesses: None 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 applicant has appropriately addressed how the proposed project that is built on past successes will lead to improvement in the achievement of students as measured against rigorous academic standards. They have described approaches that will be used to address the needs of the target population. The applicant will track data to monitor progress and report on key program educational and family and community support indicators. (p. 127, 150)

Weaknesses: None Noted

Strengths:

The applicant stated that data is presented to parents, partners, stakeholders, funders, and the community to offer an opportunity to clearly define the connections between services, results, and improvements in the Promise Neighborhood program services. They included a list of partners in the narrative and in the MOU's that specify alignment of the visions, theories of action, and theories of change. The proposal stated that they would develop a system for creating and implementing high-quality partnership between schools and corporations. (p.91, Appendix F)

Weaknesses: None 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 stated that Drexel University has brought together parties from all areas such as community residents, government, education, and businesses. For example, local efforts have been instrumental in all neighborhoods within the Promise Zone by working with residents, local leaders, and other stakeholders to bring about community change. (p.58)

Weaknesses: None Noted

Strengths:

The applicant has proposed to measure performances that are aligned to the intended outcomes of the project to produce quantitative and qualitative data. Data will be collected and used as part of a continuous improvement process. They will meet quarterly to ensure effectiveness of proposed solutions and to ensure progress toward stated outcomes. The applicant adheres to HIPAA and FERPA regulations to build an integrated longitudinal data system that will combine data from multiple sources. (p.105, 106)

Weaknesses: None 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 are reasonable in relation to the number of persons that will be served and the anticipated results and benefits. Drexel University has selected to serve a population of 29,489 underserved participants. The budget is reasonable to effectuate the stated outcomes for education reform. (Appendix)

Weaknesses: None Noted

Strengths:

The applicant stated that Drexel University has partnered with community organizations and civic associations to coordinate the management system through which every partnering organization is supported in the work within the Promise Zone. For example, Drexel has committed staff support and an existing lease agreement for hosting SLA-MS. The applicant provided a multi-year financial model and has proposed services that will involve the collaboration of appropriate partners with MOU's for maximizing the effectiveness and the sustainability of the project. (p.6, 108,124, Appendix F)

Weaknesses: None 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 has implemented plans in the narrative that were aimed at improving early learning and development outcomes. The applicant stated that the AFEL's systems approach aims to connect West Philadelphia childcare centers

and families to citywide programs and evidence-based best practices.

(p.149)

Weaknesses: None 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:

The applicant has stated that Mount Vernon Manor, a recipient of the Choice Planning grant, has provided a memorandum of understanding committing to coordinate and align resources with the proposed project. (p.29,446)

Weaknesses: None Noted

Reader's Score: 2

**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 applicant project is designated to serve and coordinate with a federally designated Promise Zone. (154,271)

Weaknesses: None 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 has provided a detailed Logic Model specifying products, aligned strategies and goals, and processes along the continuum of services to reach high school students and support their transitions into college and career opportunities. The applicant proposed evidence-based, student centered services, initiatives, interventions, evaluations, and counseling designed to improve academic success. The applicant has proposed to offer remediation services designed to help retain students and allow them to move rapidly into core courses through program completion. (p.440,476)

Weaknesses: None Noted

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 10/21/2016 11:51 AM