

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 12/01/2016 01:46 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Youth Policy Institute (U215N160059)

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 #9 - Panel - 1A: 84.215N

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Youth Policy Institute (U215N160059)

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 states that they have conducted a variety of needs assessments segmentation analysis including: Children and student-need segmentation examined needs by age cohorts; Student and school-Site review. (pg. 6) They clearly identify specific needs and demographics within the target community.

The applicant identifies that within the target city are issues including high levels of poverty, unemployment and underemployment, low educational attainment, limited English proficiency, healthcare access is a challenge, violent crime almost twice as high as the entire city, and teen birth rates are higher. (pg. 8-9)

The applicant clearly describes and explains details of the magnitude of the education issues to be addressed and measured by this grant. They provide details regarding low proficiency in Math and English; large percentage of English Language learners; need for basic literacy skills, low graduation rates, high drop-out rates, low college-going rates, and many others.

There is also a serious gap in early childhood education (ECE) services in LAPN zip codes. Family engagement and participation is another common weakness identified by principals. Elementary schools identified common gaps in services, including a need for academic tutoring, instructional coaching and leadership development to improve academic achievement.

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

- 1. The extent to which the applicant describes an implementation plan to create a complete continuum of solutions, including early learning through grade 12, college- and career-readiness, and family and community supports, without time and resource gaps, that will prepare all children in the neighborhood to attain an excellent education and successfully transition to college and a career, and that will significantly increase the proportion of students in the neighborhood that are served by the complete continuum to reach scale over time.**

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

The extent to which the applicant identifies existing neighborhood assets and programs supported by Federal, State, local, and private funds that will be used to implement a continuum of solutions.

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

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

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

General:

Strengths:

The applicant clearly describes their continuum of solutions spans from early learning through 12th grade and into postsecondary education, with a focus on college and career readiness and bolstered by key family and community supports. The applicant clearly identifies a high-level overview of the scope of their programs and the proposed number and percent of students served annually, which increases over time. (pg. 19-21)The applicant clearly includes the required GEPA statement and discusses the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA). Within most of the job descriptions the applicant clearly states that: "Maintain a professional attitude, confidentiality, and respect cultural differences".

They clearly describe each level of their activities including: Early education begins with services for children 0-3. Early Head Start (EHS) is a full-day, year-round program that promotes infant/toddler health; individualized family support services, for physical and mental health, disabilities, and parent involvement; and core model consistent across all schools. Components are customized to meet school needs (all schools have tutoring, but those struggling with Math will focus tutoring). College and career readiness is second focus on direct academic support.

Copious references, citations, and resources are provided to clearly demonstrate the best practices, research-based and evidence-based support for each and every project activity. (pg. 39-40) They clearly explain moderate and strong evidence and provide references to support these ratings.

The applicant clearly states that existing neighborhood assets are a critical LAPN component. Assets are already part of the neighborhood partnership, or will be integrated into the overall delivery of this project. In addition, they identify a number of existing programs supported by federal, state, local, and private funds including leveraged resources integrated into the continuum of solutions, such as Early Head Start.

The applicant's evaluation design includes the research & evaluation department. It has developed evaluation methods tested and are refined over time to ensure that programs are accountable to funders, make progress in achieving outcomes, and provide high quality services. Evaluation methods provide timely and valid information on management,

implementation, and efficiency of services. Using STAT they will track progress on monthly benchmarks to ensure each school site is on track to achieve annual outcomes.

The applicant clearly describes how they will collect both qualitative data to measure performance. This will occur during Community Feedback Sessions. Specific sources of data are clearly identified and listed.

The applicant clearly describes their Theory of Change and Action, which describes how effective, achievement oriented schools and strong social and community services are critical to support educational achievement of children living in poverty; and Effective change can be best achieved by serving an entire well-defined neighborhood comprehensively and at scale to reach majority of eligible youth and family residents. Their theory of action clearly describes the plan for actions affecting overall outcomes for youth and families in this project.

The applicant provides a detailed and comprehensive, signed Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with all of their partners that includes very specific roles and responsibilities for each. It states how partners will Share all client and program data; Attend professional staff training; Attend all meetings; Implement agreed upon programs and services; and share a unified theory of change and theory of action described below to implement structured change as required by the requirements. The partners agree to support the Promise Neighborhoods model by fully participating in implementation of services and in management/

oversight of all services as needed. In addition, they will be accountable for performance in accordance with the MOU through execution of partner subcontract agreements specifying number of participants served, timeline, payment, and breakdown of services. Agreements include accountability mechanisms for monthly reporting, and an in-person meeting (pg. 52, 106-131)

Weakness:

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 clearly describes how they reviewed historical data and trends, going in detail through the School Plans (Appendix F), and considered factors like YPI's past performance in achieving desired outcomes through programs described here, research on impact of similar programs serving similar populations, available resources and partners, disaggregated population results, timelines, and external factors. The applicant clearly provides annual percentage goals, based on the baseline data provided. (pg. 49-51)

There is a signed MOU that clearly states that all partners are aligned with the vision, theory of action and theory of change. What each partner will contribute for this project are clearly noted. Specific in-kind and monies are identified. They clearly describe all of the services that contribute to the continuum of solutions within the framework of broader services. There are letters of support from partners that support the MOU. Partners will be held accountable for

performance in accordance with the MOU through execution of partner subcontract agreements specifying number of participants served, timeline, payment, and breakdown of services.

In addition, the applicant clearly identifies currently funded federal programs operated by YPI that demonstrate their ability to successfully operate programs that are similar in scope to the Promise Neighborhood. They provide a detailed list, which demonstrates additional services that will be integrated into the overall delivery of the LAPN continuum of solutions. (pg.

There are numerous signed letters of support and participation from partners, school principals and other identified agencies, organizations, and stakeholders. These letters clearly identify specific project or program activities, funding, supplies, services, and facilities that they will provide for this project. These include the school district, government, and community agencies.

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 includes resumes for the identified staff. There are brief bios and job descriptions for each of the identified staff in the proposal. The applicant provides details about the background and experiences of the identified staff. There are job descriptions for many positions that will be added for this project.

The applicant clearly describes the overall management structure for this project. They identify a number of advisory groups, monitoring and supervision committees that will work to implement this project. Through quarterly LA Promise Zone Leadership Council and topical working group meetings, the vision and theories of change/action, and Promise Zone Strategic Plan educational objectives informed development of the LAPN implementation plan.

The applicant identifies that they will use the ETO as the primary system that stores and organizes intake information for students at each school. This will be a system hub for all individual level secondary data for reporting. It is where information regarding monitoring of student progress will be stored. (pg. 68) Real-time data entry and analysis includes daily assessments, quarterly report cards, surveys, qualitative analysis and feedback. Tracking and analysis helps staff understand how efforts have an effect on student outcomes.

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:

There is a detailed budget and itemized budget organized by major categories and years. The budget reflects reasonable and appropriate costs. They clearly provide an annual per client cost to demonstrate this.

The applicant clearly describes and identifies what each of the partners will contribute in the way of in-kind services, support and resources. Monies that will be provided are clearly identified.

The applicant identifies specific staff that will have the responsibility of securing additional funding for years 6 to 10. They clearly describe in the Financial and Operating Sustainability Plan in Appendix (p. 542), YPI and partners have developed a realistic model for sustaining LAPN services in Years 6-10 and beyond. It incorporates private and public funding anticipated to be integrated into the LAPN budget beginning in Year 3 of the grant, with increases through Year 10 to accommodate loss of federal Promise Neighborhood funds beginning in 2022.

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 clearly requests this Competitive Preference. The applicant's program design clearly discusses how they will implement Early Learning components that will clearly meet these competitive preference requirements; including through implementation of an early education pipeline, and ensuring education access at all levels through improving school readiness for preschool aged children so each child enters kindergarten healthy and ready to learn. (pg. 21-24, 73-74)

The applicant provides details regarding how they implement their EHS/HS program within the communities and how they will scale best practices throughout the whole Promise Neighborhood program over time. The early education program begins in Early Head Start, which delivers services for children 0-3 each year. Early Head Start (EHS) is a full-day, year-round program that promotes infant/toddler health; cognitive, physical, social, and emotional development; fulfillment of parental responsibilities; preschool readiness; and family self-sufficiency. The program and curriculum consist of research-based Creative Curriculum, plus parental involvement in curriculum planning and teaching strategies, which are the main components of the educational services. The Creative Curriculum is based on 38 objectives for early childhood development aligned with School Readiness Goals for Infants and Toddlers and state early learning standards. Creative Curriculum emphasizes the active exploration of the child's environment; self-directed, hands-on activities; balance between individual, group activities; regular and supportive interaction with teachers and peers; and balance between active movement and quiet activities.

In addition, they provide individualized family support services. An interdisciplinary team, with experts on physical and mental health, disabilities, and parent involvement, provides in-home support for the family. Family support services are provided in the home language of clients, as needed.

All children will be measured for kindergarten readiness by assessing developmental stages using the Ages and Stages Questionnaire (ASQ). The ASQ screening will identify children who may have or be at risk of developmental delay or disability and need more evaluation. Screenings ensure that atypical development is identified and that children are referred to a Social Worker, who enhances parent's ability to contribute to child's development.

As children age out of EHS, LAPN and EHS staff will help them transition to LAPN school Hollywood Primary Center as part of early education pipeline with no time or resource gaps. There are comprehensive options for the children including: general education pre-kindergarten, and a Preschool for All (PAL) program for special needs children, with comprehensive preschool and intensive therapy. There is a Transitional Kindergarten (TK) class which is built on the CA Kindergarten Common Core State Standards with instruction in literacy and numeracy.

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 clearly identifies that their city and the Neighborhood will serve geographic areas that were the subject of affordable housing transformation pursuant to a Choice Neighborhoods grant awarded by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development in 2013.

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 clearly requests this Competitive Preference. The city is identified as a Promise Zone.

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 clearly states that they will address this priority. To meet the criteria they describe implementing full time AmeriCorps tutors (p. 28) and Academic Coaches strengthen instruction, and to ensure students are academically prepared for college (p. 26). High school students will take dual enrollment courses (p. 33) for college credit to ensure they complete requirements to enter college without remediation. Academic tutoring is provided to students not proficient in core subjects, and including support for English Learners (ELs) that make up a high proportion of school enrollment. Tutoring is offered during school hours, and before- and after-school.

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 12/01/2016 01:46 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 12/01/2016 03:00 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Youth Policy Institute (U215N160059)

Reader #2: *****

	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 #9 - Panel - 1A: 84.215N

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Youth Policy Institute (U215N160059)

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 LA Promise Zone has over 165,000 residents and over 40 schools, A needs assessment and segmentation analysis was used to identify areas and schools in greatest need. The needs assessment included primary data through interviews, focus groups, and secondary data. In order to delineate an implementation plan that prioritizes children with highest needs, segmentation analyses were conducted in three parts: (a) overall geographic density and spatial analysis of need (e.g. poverty, educational attainment); (b) child and student sub-variable need by educational segment; and (c) student and school need by target site. These compartmentalized segmentation analyses were used to develop the design for core services, identify areas of highest need within the Promise Zone boundary to target with a Promise Neighborhood, select target schools, and plan for how to target services within schools to serve students most in need (page 7). A specific example of how the Children and Student-Need Segmentation examined needs by age cohorts found that high school students had very high truancy rates, for example, and by sub-population like English Learners. Segmentation analysis identified common needs across schools, which creates efficiencies of scale for interventions, while also ensuring program design is targeting highest need groups.

The northern section is in Hollywood and is bordered by Cahuenga Blvd. to the West, Fountain Ave. to the North, Gower St. to the East, and Santa Monica Blvd. to the South. The Los Angeles Promise Neighborhood in the Promise Zone (LAPN) encompasses the communities of Hollywood and Pico-Union/Westlake, which have 19,015 residents and 6,970 households (American Community Survey (ACS) 2010-14). 25% (4,729) of all residents are under the age of 19 and 6.7% (1,266) are under 5 years of age. The population is largely Latino (73%) with 35% foreign born. Pico-Union/Westlake has a large population of Central American immigrants (page 15).

The applicant successfully addresses a number of gaps in services and infrastructure. For example, a serious gap in early childhood education (ECE) services are found in LAPN zip codes, which have 8,824 children ages 0-5 (ACS 2014), but only 896 available licensed early education seats, indicating that about 10% of LAPN children have access to a secured early education seat (Advancement Project, 2015; City of LA, 2015). This gap in services - no licensed early education slots for 90% of young LAPN children - adversely affects the birth-to-school entry continuum, as interconnected early care and education is necessary for future success (page 16).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were identified.

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

- 1. The extent to which the applicant describes an implementation plan to create a complete continuum of solutions, including early learning through grade 12, college- and career-readiness, and family and community supports, without time and resource gaps, that will prepare all children in the neighborhood to attain an excellent education and successfully transition to college and a career, and that will significantly increase the proportion of students in the neighborhood that are served by the complete continuum to reach scale over time.**

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

The extent to which the applicant identifies existing neighborhood assets and programs supported by Federal, State, local, and private funds that will be used to implement a continuum of solutions.

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

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

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

General:

Strengths:

The LAPN continuum of solutions spans early learning through 12th grade and into postsecondary education, with a focus on college and career readiness and bolstered by key family and community supports. One example of services provided with initial focus on the early childhood age group is the provision of individualized family support services. An interdisciplinary team, with content area experts on physical and mental health, disabilities, and parent involvement, supports staff. Twice a month teachers and family services associates participate in reflective supervision and have case conferences, during which staff review and report progress on needs (health, mental health, substance use, housing and employment). A mental health consultant provides guidance on screening results, diagnosis, and treatment needs, and provides family counseling. Family support services are provided in the home language of clients (page 22).

The applicant provides substantial evidence in support of the proposed solutions. The program is consistent with evidence on similar models and programmatic elements for effectiveness. There is moderate evidence that LAPN model will have a statistically significant effect on improving student achievement, closing achievement gaps, and increasing high school graduation rates. Appendix F includes research supporting strategies, including Early Childhood Education (p. 370), 21st Century Technology (p. 476), Academic Tutoring (p. 403), Academic Coaches and Teacher Professional Development (p. 394), Afterschool Services (p. 470), College and Career Readiness (p. 156), Parent Engagement (p. 463), Intake, Assessment, and Linkages (p. 379), Dual Enrollment (p. 436), Truancy Reduction and Prevention (p. 389).

Existing neighborhood assets are an integral LAPN component. Assets are already part of the neighborhood partnership, or will be integrated over the five-year implementation period. Community School Coordinators stationed at each school are responsible for spearheading partnership development, and will engage in monthly outreach to add more service providers to the LAPN network. YPI's community schools model has managed such partnerships in this community since 2010, which has accelerated in LAPN planning. In addition to creating a more robust network of family

and community services in the LAPN, partners benefit from LAPN's system of cross-referrals that provides LAPN services to their existing clients in need. Coordinators work with agencies to set up cross referrals in LAPN or within a half mile of boundaries. Coordinators will work with Connectors and MSW Interns to ensure that clients have an affordable transportation plan to access services (through carpools or public transit, for example) (page 42).

The evaluation plan will track individual, family, school, and community-level data on outcomes using the Efforts-to-Outcomes (ETO) longitudinal data system. Each student, parent, or resident will have individual ETO profile that tracks points of service, assessment data, and student level data such as grades, standardized test scores, school attendance, and suspensions. Data collection benefits from YPI's existing Data Sharing Agreement with LAUSD, allowing for collection of 72 different data points (page 44).

The LAPN theory of change includes following principles. 1) Effective, achievement oriented schools and strong social and community services are critical to support educational achievement of children in poverty. 2) Effective change can be best achieved by serving an entire well-defined neighborhood comprehensively and at scale to reach majority of eligible youth and family residents. 3) Change is best achieved through strategies that include a well thought out pipeline of high quality programs, services and activities that start from birth and continue to college graduation and career. Change will be expected and measured in common goals, objectives, and outcomes on the individual, family, and community level. 4) Activities must be resident and family driven; building social capital is a significant pathway to desired change. Resident and family participation are essential to building active community support and involvement in program services. 5) Accountability for outcomes is key (page 46). The Theory of Change combined with studies in support of the proposed work serve as a strong indicator for the alignment of program components with program goals.

Weaknesses: No weaknesses were 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:

The applicant's efforts to achieve the goal of student achievement as measured against rigorous academic standards include efforts led by YPI's Research & Evaluation team and YPI staff from Community Schools and Academic Support teams to set annual targets for the overall project and for each individual school. Privacy and confidentiality were included in HIPAA requirements for job descriptions of key personnel as described in the MOU (Appendix C). Efforts to measure against rigorous academic standards included reviewing historical data and trends, going in detail through the School Plans (see Appendix F), and considering factors like YPI's past performance in achieving desired outcomes through programs described here, research on impact of similar programs serving similar populations, available resources and partners, disaggregated population results, timelines, and external factors. School targets were then reviewed with each principal to ensure alignment with school goals for improving academic achievement, and to take into account any school-related factors affecting targets. The result are annual targets for each project and program indicator that are ambitious given the current baseline data demonstrating significant needs, but are also realistic given the infusion of intentionally designed resources that align directly with moving the needle on the indicators. Additional comparisons are made against standardized test national

trend data (page 49).

The Promise Zone Leadership Council is comprised of 17 members. Of these 17 members, eight have joined the LAPN partnership, demonstrating strong linkages, including an existing partnership structure and system for accountability. YPI and LAPN partners developed the LAPN overall vision and theories of change and action to align with those of the Promise Zone (page 3 of MOU). Signed commitment letters and MOUs identify the accountability structure that has been agreed upon (page 51). In addition, in term of accountability, the application states that if a partner's performance lags after receiving three months of support, their contract will end (page 52).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were 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: As lead agency and fiscal agent, YPI provides administrative oversight. YPI is responsible for working with schools, districts, and community partners; monitoring and supporting activities so that they converge with school and classroom goals and agendas; providing technical assistance to schools and partners; and managing fiscal matters, client attendance data and evaluation results as required by the U.S. Department of Education. With a staff of over 1,600 qualified and experienced professionals reaching 115,000 unduplicated residents annually at 137 sites throughout LA County, YPI has demonstrated a unique ability to produce significant outcomes by saturating neighborhoods with relevant, place-based education and training services. YPI has extensive experience providing many of the solutions from the LAPN continuum of solutions and is leveraging the central role of the LAPN within the LA Promise Zone. YPI's ability to operate successful place-based initiatives is made possible through a 'braiding' of public and private revenues that target communities, while incorporating resident, family, and community assets into program design and services (page 57).

YPI and partners utilize its existing Efforts-to-Outcomes (ETO) longitudinal database system to track and measure impact of LAPN programs using indicators and targets discussed on pages 50-51. ETO will track service utilization, along with locations and frequency, outcomes across providers, and will look at aggregate results across schools. YPI is one of a few external

agencies provided access to student level data (documented in Data Sharing and Master Services Agreements with LAUSD) and collects outcome data in ETO working with LAUSD and schools. To track and analyze information, YPI utilizes ETO from Social Solutions as a hub for organizing, monitoring and analyzing data. Social Solutions developed an early partnership with Promise Neighborhoods, and the system is built to address data management support and data driven-decision making tools essential to run, manage, and implement LAPN (page 67).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were identified.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

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

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

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

General:

Strengths:

Total program cost (both federal and matching contributions) over the five-year period is \$60 million. With YPI's increased number of students and families served over time, the project will become increasingly cost effective, particularly in relation to results demonstrated by five-year targets on pages 50-51. YPI asserts that as Promise Neighborhood implementation proceeds, the partnership will serve a greater number of individuals each year, while achieving increases on indicators at a greater rate over time (page 70).

YPI resources include active management and administration of 21 grants from seven federal departments (Education, Health & Human Services, IRS, Agriculture, Justice, and Corporation for National Community Service) that total \$38,745,909. YPI also operates contracts from the City of LA to manage and administer public funding for FamilySource, YouthSource, and WorkSource Centers, Summer Youth Employment, and Gang Reduction & Youth Development; all will be integrated in LAPN and continue beyond the five-year grant, including similar contracts operated by partners. YPI's track record in raising and managing funds in place-based initiatives is reflected in YPI's growth in recent years, which has seen YPI's annual budget increase tenfold, from \$4 million in 2007 to current annual budget of over \$44 million. Based on this trajectory of funding, YPI and partners have developed a realistic model for sustaining LAPN services in Years 6-10 and beyond (pages 70-72).

Weaknesses: No weaknesses were 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: YPI efforts in the area of early childhood are comprehensive. The system-based Creative Curriculum is based around 38 objectives for early childhood development aligned with School Readiness Goals for Infants and Toddlers and state early learning standards, as well as adaptive skills and social emotional skills. Creative Curriculum emphasizes active exploration of environment; self-directed, hands-on activities; balance between individual, group activities; regular and supportive interaction with teachers and peers; and balance between active movement and quiet activities (page 22).

Weaknesses: No weaknesses were 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:

Strengths: YPI and the Neighborhood will serve geographic areas that were the subject of affordable housing transformation pursuant to a Choice Neighborhoods grant awarded by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development in 2013.

Weaknesses: No weaknesses were identified.

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:

Los Angeles was selected in the first round of President Obama's federally designated Promise Zones in 2014. The City of Los Angeles as Lead Agency joined with YPI as the Lead Implementation Partner of the LA Promise Zone in

recognition of YPI's track record in community revitalization and place-based initiatives. The proposed LA Promise Neighborhood is a core part of the LA Promise Zone strategic plan, and will be integrated into leadership and administrative framework of the Zone to meet Education objectives (page 2).

Weaknesses: No weaknesses were identified.

Reader's Score: 2

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

High School and Transition to College

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

General:

Strengths: LAPN will increase number and proportion of high need students (e.g. students who are at risk of educational failure, or are living in poverty), who are academically prepared for, enroll in, or complete on time college, other postsecondary education, or other career and technical education, and therefore qualifies for 2 additional preference points. Multiple strategies in the continuum of solutions are intentionally designed to achieve this goal. Each school will have full time AmeriCorps tutors (p. 28) and Academic Coaches strengthen instruction, to ensure students are academically prepared for college (p. 26).

Weaknesses: No weaknesses were identified.

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 12/01/2016 03:00 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 12/01/2016 01:39 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Youth Policy Institute (U215N160059)

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 #9 - Panel - 1A: 84.215N

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Youth Policy Institute (U215N160059)

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, a nonprofit organization located in the state of California, plans to provide activities and services to students to target areas located in the city of Los Angeles. Focusing on four target schools, the applicant will work with partners to improve student achievement and create a pipeline of academic and social resources to assist students in becoming college employment ready. The applicant reports that the target area has 32.7% of its families living below the federal poverty level and 21% of the households have incomes of less than \$15,000 (page 8). In addition, the applicant reports that 38% of the families have difficulties acquiring medical care and 24% of the children do not have dental insurance. Teen birth rates are higher in the target area (36 births per 1000). The applicant also indicates that all four schools in the target area have an average free and reduced lunch rate of 94%, a rate that is higher than the overall city (76%) and the state (59%). At the elementary grade level, or four-fifths of the students are not at grade level in either English Language Arts or Mathematics (page 11). This information demonstrates a need for the project.

The target area being served by the project consists of two noncontiguous areas of the city of Los Angeles (page 15). The target area is part of a Promise Zone as well as a Choice Neighborhood program.

The applicant identifies a number of gaps or weaknesses currently present in the target area. Included is an early childhood education gap and a family engagement weakness which were identified in a needs assessment (page 16). Similarly, the applicant reports that there is a gap in college readiness; however, there is 32 percentage points between those students who aspire to attend a four-year university and those who meet the minimum requirements for acceptance (page 17). In addition, the applicant indicates that middle schools identified mental health services, tutoring, and family engagement as well. These gaps are documented with appropriate information and support a need for the project.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

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 offered by the applicant to provide a complete continuum of solutions focuses on early childhood education programs, K-12 student population, and opportunities for youth outside school. In terms of early education, the applicant is focusing on early head start programs, preschool, transitional kindergarten, and other transitional programs. For example, working with a partner, the project will provide individualized family support services to assist parents in meeting with teachers as well as providing physical and mental health services for their child (page 22). The K-12 segment includes social and emotional support counseling, academic program support, academic tutoring, college and career readiness programs, and other support efforts. For example, special advisory sessions called Road Map to College will be provided and further assist with tutoring and exploring college information (page 30). The continuum also includes efforts to transform schools in two more effective learning environments as well as advancing the community school concept (page 35). Programs for family and community support will also be provided and will work with various participants in federally funded grants to enhance the benefits and improve assistance. Overall, the applicant provides a positive continuum of solutions.

The applicant provides a substantial body of research to support the overall efforts to provide a continuum of solutions to the target area. For example, the applicant cites the research of Carrel and Sacrdote (2013) to support its college coaching for high school students using "near peers" (page 40). Content area teaching included in the program is based on evidence from studies that are included in the What Works Clearinghouse as well as in a number of studies (Vaugh et al, 2009; Ryoo, 2009) (page 40). The activities conducted in conjunction with AmeriCorps are also supported by research from Markovitz et al (2014). These studies are timely and appropriate to support and establish that the programs are based on evidence of success.

The applicant describes its efforts to affiliate and work with established neighborhood assets. As it points out, the applicant notes that many of these assets are a part of its neighborhood partnerships (page 42). The applicant already works with such organizations as the Salvation Army Senior Citizen Center, Project Angel Food, Year Round Shelter, Youth Network, Children's Hospital, the public library, and a number of churches and faith based organizations. The California Department of Education partners with the applicant to fund a 21st Century Community Learning center as well

as an After School Education and Safety program.

The applicant has initiated evaluation processes that make the programs accountable to funders, assesses progress toward achieving outcomes, and measures to maintain quality of activities and services (page 44). The applicant has a Research and Evaluation Department that provides assistance in data collection, analysis and reporting. The applicant notes that it has a STAT report modeled after the Harlem Children's Zone that tracks outcomes, budgets, and service provisions. The reporting process will keep track of individual youth and resident clients, participating schools, and neighborhood change levels. The information will be compiled and reported to all stakeholders. Both qualitative and quantitative data will be collected and made available on a regular basis. This material will also be coordinated with the school districts Common Core Smarter Balanced assessment program (page 46).

In addition to the research provided by the applicant to support the individual activities and services, the applicant includes a logic model which describes its theory of change and how it expects the various components to interrelate and achieve outcomes. The logic model includes specific inputs or resources to conduct a project and aligns them with the activities and outputs to be expected (page 48). In addition, the model includes short-term and medium-term outcomes or evidence of change. The logic model is complete and reflects the components of the project as described in the design. As a result, the project is based on a strong theory of change.

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 provides very specific outcome results and indicators to enhance the likelihood of success for the proposed activities and services. For each of its major activities, the applicant identifies specific activities, a baseline of data for activities, and a projected number and percent of change being anticipated (pages 50-51). For example, focusing on students that feel safe at their school and in the community, the applicant establishes a baseline of 53% (N= 1,579) in the project for each of the next five years, ending with a projected rate of 72% (N=2,145). This process provides the project with a rigorous standard to accomplish. In addition, the applicant has based its activities on the standards found throughout the US Department of Education publication, What Works Clearinghouse (page 40). These activities insure that the applicant is seeking improvement of students in terms of rigorous academic standards.

The applicant includes a signed Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) reflecting its ability to identify and implement partnerships designed to improve schools and community. The MOU will be the basis upon which the various partners participate and be held accountable for their participation, including the designation of the lead agency and the acceptance of a shared vision for the project (page 52). The formalized partnerships are clearly delineated in the document and the specific requirements for each of the partners are described in this section in detail. For example, the city of Los Angeles is leveraging in-kind and aligned resources to support education and economic empowerment through

three projects and a summer youth paid work opportunity and gang prevention program (page 53). The director will be responsible for oversight as well as for resolving any difficulties and ensuring that all partners will fulfill their obligations.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

Collecting, analyzing, and using data for decision-making, learning, continuous improvement, and accountability, including whether the applicant has a plan to build, adapt, or expand a longitudinal data system that integrates student-level data from multiple sources in order to measure progress while abiding by privacy laws and requirements.

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

General:

Strengths:

The management plan provided by the applicant reflects an ability to oversee and administer the various components of the project as well as the partners that are participating. The applicant has clearly indicated its ability to work with other partners at 137 different sites throughout the county (page 58). In addition, the applicant identifies four major programs which will be integrated into the continuum of solutions and enhanced by the project activities and services. The programs include a criminal justice program, Gear up, full-service community schools, and a school climate transformation grant. Using a Leadership Council, the applicant will develop a relationship with all the various working partners in groups to initiate, implement and manage the activities of the project (page 62). The applicant provides a description of its staff as well as their level of experience and responsibilities.

The applicant is employing its existing Efforts to Outcomes longitudinal database to track participation, collect data, and organize for reporting (page 67). The system will be used to address data management support and assist in making decisions. The database has the capability to collect and store substantial amounts of data and support such management tasks as intake and case management, partner information tracking, secondary data reporting and analysis, and real-time data tracking and program assessment. The system will create a quarterly STAT report that will provide both formative and summative evaluation reports for all stakeholders.

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 initial budget request for the project is \$6 million which includes allocations for personnel, fringe benefits, travel, supplies, contractual services, and other expenses (page e6). The applicant includes in the narrative a detailed breakdown of the estimated number of participants served annually and the cost per client which indicates a cost that ranges from \$2,529 in year one to \$1,967 in year five. The number of clients range from 4,744 in year one to 6,100 in year five. This information indicates that the budget allocations are reasonable and will assist the project in attaining its objectives.

The applicant indicates that it has a proactive management and administration program that includes 21 grants from seven different federal agencies (page 71). Its ability to identify and attain grants is supported by this history. It is the intention of the applicant to seek additional grants from the federal government as well as from other agencies such as the state or private foundations. Applicant also indicates that it will integrate existing funding supports of the continuum into regular budgets and operating expenses of the partners.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 15

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority

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

Improving Early Learning Development and Outcomes

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

General:

Strengths:

The applicant indicates it is committed to improving coordination among early learning program providers and aligned the various early childhood programs with elementary school curriculum programs (page 73). In addition, the applicant is committed to ensuring educational access at all levels by improving school readiness for preschool age children. Such a process would ensure that each child will enter kindergarten healthy and ready to learn.

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:

Strengths:

The applicant indicates that the target area is subject to an affordable housing transformation plan pursuant to a Choice Neighborhood grant awarded by the US Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

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 target area has been designated a Promise Zone.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 2

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

High School and Transition to College

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

General:

Strengths:

The applicant will increase the number and proportion of high need students who are academically prepared, enrolled in, or complete college on time. It also plans to increase the number and proportion of students who attain eligibility for career and technical educational opportunities (page 75). The applicant will work with such organizations as AmeriCorps and will use academic coaches to strengthen instruction and prepare students for college or work. The applicant will provide college advising, parent workshops, career mapping, college information sessions, and workshops on financial planning.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 12/01/2016 01:39 PM