

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/11/2018 01:51 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Delta Health Alliance, Inc. (U215N180011)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Strength of demonstrated performance		
Strength of demonstrated performance		
1. Demonstrated performance	50	50
Sub Total	50	50
Quality of project design		
Quality of project design		
1. Project design	20	20
Sub Total	20	20
Quality of the management plan		
Quality of the management plan		
1. Management Plan	15	15
Sub Total	15	15
Adequacy of resources		
Adequacy of resources		
1. Adequacy of resources	15	15
Sub Total	15	15
Total	100	100

Technical Review Form

Panel #6 - Promise Neighborhoods Extension Grants - 6: 84.215N

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Delta Health Alliance, Inc. (U215N180011)

Questions

Strength of demonstrated performance - Strength of demonstrated performance

1. The Secretary considers the extent to which the applicant demonstrates, based on performance in its implementation grant, the following:
 - (i) the ability to collect, track, and report GPRA data on performance indicators established by the Department and required to be reported on annually as part of the initial implementation grant;
 - (ii) the most positive and promising results during its initial implementation grant based on such indicators, emphasizing getting children ready to learn; and
 - (iii) a commitment to operating in the most underserved and under-resourced, including rural, areas.In addition to the applicant's narrative response to sub-criterion (i), the applicant must include GPRA data on Department-established performance indicators as described above and a summary of the initial implementation grant for Appendix A – PN GPRA Data and Implementation Grant Summary.

Strengths:

Strengths:

The applicant clearly and thoroughly describes and details activities and outcomes across the application. Strikingly, the applicant reports that “annual reviews of case files have also demonstrated that zero children enrolled in the program fell through the cracks. Every child identified received assistance.” (p. e17).

i. The applicant illustrates the ability to collect, track and report GPRA data on performance indicators using multiple tools that connect all programs enabling both program and individual level data. (pg. e17-20). The applicant has implemented an accountability process – collecting data monthly, sharing results back with staff and using data to drive decisions; identifying results and areas for corrective action. (p. e19-20).

Throughout, the narrative provides examples of progress. For example, the Literacy Fellows program provides at-risk students reading support one hour per day/5 days per week. The result from implementation is that 73% of at-risk students passed the “reading gate” in 2017 compared to the 36% in 2015. (pg. e31).

ii. The applicant thoroughly describes the promising results, based on indicators, especially in getting children ready to learn. The grant partners have a multi-level engagement beginning before birth with maternal home visits and continuing through the years with a variety of projects such as monthly books and childcare support. (e20-21).

An example of positive and promising results is in getting children ready to learn. The applicant's results show that kindergarten readiness has more than doubled in three years (from 25% to 64%), (e17).

iii. The applicant clearly demonstrates its commitment to operating in the most underserved, under-resourced rural areas. Delta Health Alliance (DHA) is a non-profit, community-based organization that serves 17 rural counties of the Mississippi Delta in northwest Mississippi - one of the historically poorest, underserved regions of the United States. (e35). As reported in the 24/7 Wall Street study, Indianola was named “the poorest town in the poorest state of our nation” (e36).

The service area has significant challenges including 32.3% of households in Indianola receive SNAP benefits compared to 18.0% of Mississippi households, and Indianola's Sunflower County is ranked 19th nation-wide of rural counties with the highest poverty. Nearly a third (31.8%) of Indianola residents live below the poverty level as compared to 20.8% for Mississippi, and more than one in five Indianola adults are without health insurance (20.6%) (e37). Table I illustrates the disparities. (e37).

The applicant provided GPRA data on indicators and a summary of the initial implementation grant. (e85-95).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses identified.

Reader's Score: 50

Quality of project design - Quality of project design

- 1. The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed extension project. In determining the quality of the proposed extension project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**
 - (i) the extent to which the applicant proposes continuing to pursue ambitious goals during the proposed project; and**
 - (ii) the extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.**

Strengths:

Strengths:

i. The applicant provides information that demonstrates its intent to continue ambitious goals by bringing to sustainability eight (8) programs currently being implemented. (e38). The programs are comprehensive in their descriptions including the targeted enrollees, targeted enrollment, alignment to GPRA indicators, citing relevance and evidence. (e 39-51).

For instance, LINKS targets the most at-risk students to improve growth in reading and math as measured by the school's benchmark assessment and addressing 11 of the GPRA indicators. (e39). The applicant demonstrates a comprehensive approach to affecting change. This is convincing in the goals selected for the extension program, the coordination of data collection and feedback and through the ambitious goal of building sustainability through policy development as a part of the grant's continuum of solutions. (e51-52).

ii. The project narrative (e38-51) and Appendix B (e243/MOU) provide a comprehensive description of each program, its alignment to ambitious goals, GPRA indicators, and identifying the lead partner. The applicant adequately describes the data collection for the continuum of programs using a performance scorecard to drive monthly conversations which lead to action plans as needed. (e251).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses identified.

Reader's Score: 20

Quality of the management plan - Quality of the management plan

- 1. The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed extension project. In determining the quality of the management plan for the proposed extension project, the Secretary considers the adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.**

Strengths:

Strengths:

The applicant has clearly documented examples of achieving objectives under the existing grant and there is evidence (MOU, illustrated success, GPRA indicators) that the extension activities will be implemented with success.

Table 2 (e55) provides introductions to the five (5) Delta Health Alliance/IPC Governing Board. These industry leaders

represent a variety of business and education sectors relevant to the work of the grant. Table 3 illustrates the community leadership including an accountability committee and advisory group. (e57)

Appendix B thoroughly outlines the goals with clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones. (e103-129). Following these tables, the applicant aligns each goal to a GPRA indicator providing quarterly benchmarks and milestones. (e130-193)

The budget aligns to activities described in the application and fulfills the required matching commitment. (e284-290)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses identified.

Reader's Score: 15

Adequacy of resources - Adequacy of resources

- 1. The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources for the proposed extension project. In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed extension project, the Secretary considers the relevance and demonstrated commitment of each partner in the proposed project to the implementation and success of the project during the extension period.**

Strengths:

Strengths:

The key staff resumes (e194-242) strongly demonstrate the experience and knowledge necessary for continued implementation. The fiscal agent, Delta Health Alliance has managed numerous grants over fifteen (15) years (e68) (e200-210) and has extensive experience in leading partnering efforts. (e68).

The partners' commitment as described in the MOU and partner letters detail their contributions to the extension application (e243 – 268), as well as the narrative descriptions on pgs. e70-79 highlighting the relevance of each partner.

The Theories of Action and Change are presented as a unified and integrated approach on pg. e67 and speak to the comprehensive outlook for the education, health and economic success of participants.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses identified.

Reader's Score: 15

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/11/2018 01:51 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/11/2018 01:51 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Delta Health Alliance, Inc. (U215N180011)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Strength of demonstrated performance		
Strength of demonstrated performance		
1. Demonstrated performance	50	50
Sub Total	50	50
Quality of project design		
Quality of project design		
1. Project design	20	20
Sub Total	20	20
Quality of the management plan		
Quality of the management plan		
1. Management Plan	15	15
Sub Total	15	15
Adequacy of resources		
Adequacy of resources		
1. Adequacy of resources	15	15
Sub Total	15	15
Total	100	100

Technical Review Form

Panel #6 - Promise Neighborhoods Extension Grants - 6: 84.215N

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Delta Health Alliance, Inc. (U215N180011)

Questions

Strength of demonstrated performance - Strength of demonstrated performance

1. The Secretary considers the extent to which the applicant demonstrates, based on performance in its implementation grant, the following:
 - (i) the ability to collect, track, and report GPRA data on performance indicators established by the Department and required to be reported on annually as part of the initial implementation grant;
 - (ii) the most positive and promising results during its initial implementation grant based on such indicators, emphasizing getting children ready to learn; and
 - (iii) a commitment to operating in the most underserved and under-resourced, including rural, areas.In addition to the applicant's narrative response to sub-criterion (i), the applicant must include GPRA data on Department-established performance indicators as described above and a summary of the initial implementation grant for Appendix A – PN GPRA Data and Implementation Grant Summary.

Strengths:

(i) The applicant presents a solid plan for collecting, tracking and reporting GPRA data through current tracking for enrolled programming and tracking collected from eight projects supported by the GPRA extension period. These tracking measures include the following: GPRA 1 – Data is tracked through referrals from Indianola Family Medical Clinic. (Pages 31, 32). Data tracked and collected are through enrollment forms placed in areas such as early childhood facilities, childcare centers, schools, health clinics, faith-based centers, libraries and area businesses. The Project manager will collect the enrollment forms located in drop boxes and immediately enroll the child into the program. (Pages 31, 32). GPRA 2 – Data is tracked and collected through an Ages and Stages questionnaire that measures a child's age development through the applicant's home visitation program. The child's gross motor, communication, and problem-solving skills are measured in a data analysis. (Pages 37, 38).

GPRA 3 – Data is tracked and collected through the program's Imagination Library where staff identifies three-year-old and kindergarten children who are eligible for IL enrollment and dual enrollment into other IPC programs. ETO data reports determine the percentage of and average of SPARK participants. Data is tracked through IPC and other parent resources. Through LINKS home visits documented children ages 0 to 5 are found without participation in formal early learning program and are referred. (Pages 45 and 46).

(ii) The applicant's most positive and promising results during its initial implementation grant are the development of sustainability and business plans for initiatives led by the DHA and partners that comprise the IPC program pipeline. As a result, the IPC Here to Stay sustainability plan was developed by the IPC Community Steering Committee. (Page 12, IPC Project Design – Sustainability).

(iii) The applicant shows a commitment to operate in the rural area of Sunflower County as well as Bolivar, Coahoma, Holmes, Leflore, Panola, Tunica, Warren, Washington, and Yazoo counties. (Page 15, IPC Project Design – Sustainability).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Quality of project design - Quality of project design

1. **The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed extension project. In determining the quality of the proposed extension project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**
 - (i) the extent to which the applicant proposes continuing to pursue ambitious goals during the proposed project; and
 - (ii) the extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.

Strengths:

The quality of the proposal's design exemplifies a project that meets the needs of the target population and educates parents on child development skills. The goals presented capitalizes on these goal centered achievements. For example, in Goal 1, the applicant's goals continue to improve the absenteeism, behavior, and academic performance of at-risk students through behavioral referrals within the first nine weeks the program and when testing data is collected at the beginning of the school year. The data is tracked monthly with the percentage of roster slots filled, family visitations that are completed and the number of families enrolled with a plan comprised of goals. (Goal 1 – Page 3).

The applicant's plan includes the participation of families to support their children by linking the head of the family with IPC programs such as social services. The data is tracked monthly with the percentage referrals to internal and external programs and the percent of completed referrals. (Goal 2 – Page 4).

The applicant's project design involves women's health and understanding of the importance of early childhood development by utilizing core employees to recruit talented women from area communities, provide healthy baby training and on-the-job training. The data is tracked quarterly to determine whether program operates at 100 percent full staff capacity; program enrollment is 100 or more participants; and home visits are completed at a rate of 85% and group connections reach one target per month. (Goal 1 – Page 5).

The applicant's plan involves educating parents on assess pregnancy timeframes and the importance of conceiving, if desired, at 18-month intervals to mitigate risks. The data is tracked quarterly and assessed with the percentage of prenatal participants; percentage of participants who receive postnatal depression screening and the percentage of at-risk participants who receive referral services. The data is tracked quarterly and evaluated with a percentage of the target market participants who receive screening for postnatal depression; the percentage of at-risk participants who receive referral services; participants who receive IPV screenings; and participants who read to their children daily. (Goal 3 – Page 7).

The applicant plans to ensure a child's school readiness and academic success by identifying children with low literacy assessments and explain the importance of reading to parents, obtaining parental consent and providing program orientation. Also, the program will educate parents on available reading services and encourage them to read with their children. The data is tracked quarterly to show participants who reach developmental benchmarks; percentage of children prepared for kindergarten; growth in reading and math assessment as well as home visit completion rates, the percentage of families participating in program and school events; number of reading events tracked monthly, number of referrals to internal and external programs; and program enrollment at 150 or more participants. (Goal 4 - Pages 9; Goal 1 – Page 11; Goal 1 – Page 13).

The applicant's plans to hold literacy recruitment events for alumni, teachers and Literacy Fellows will assist with conducting orientation and training for the target student population. The data is tracked quarterly and evaluated with a percentage of the target market participants who show growth in reading and math assessment (Goal 3 – Page 18).

The applicant plans to implement IPC Summer Camps to provide programming that focuses on literacy as the primary academic goal. The applicant plans to significantly increase reading speed, comprehension and reading attention spans

by one or two grade levels among students K-3rd grade. The data is tracked through attendance at TA sessions, score sheets compiled and submitted to DHA staff, attendance trainings, enrollment and consent forms filed and a recruitment plan. (Goal 1 – Page 19).

(i) The applicant's project goals, objectives, and outcomes are specific and measurable; such as utilizing reading and math assessments to demonstrate growth through in reading comprehension by using iPads, Galaxy tablets and desktop or laptop computers. The data is tracked quarterly and evaluated with a percentage of the target market participants who show growth in reading and math assessment and those considered proficient in reading assessments. (Appendix B – Goal 2 - Page 20).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 20

Quality of the management plan - Quality of the management plan

- 1. The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed extension project. In determining the quality of the management plan for the proposed extension project, the Secretary considers the adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.**

Strengths:

In reviewing this proposal, my evaluation finds the application presents a management plan that supports a fully operational project plan with management staff that exceeds educational requirements and experience needed to complete their goals. The project utilizes a combined 11 childcare centers, head start programs, hospitals, medical clinics, post offices, faith-based organizations, WIC distribution centers and libraries to serve the target population. The president and CEO is an accomplished administrator who has served a lifetime in community-based research and services to eliminate health problem and disease in impoverished communities. The assistant vice president of outreach is experienced in school and community programs for Indianola Promise Neighborhoods community. As a result, these administrators alone offer the level of supervision and guidance needed operate a multi-million budget and city-wide staff working at various childcare centers. The applicant presents a detailed sustainability plan that outlines the integration of the project's various revenue streams from private foundations, individuals, corporations, state and federal funding. The level of community support that these projects receive will continue to excel with levels of corporate funding from Leland Medical Clinic (LMC) and Monsanto, AT & T-MS and Energy -MS, Teach for America and Children's Defense Fund as well as school districts, cities and community development corporations. (IPC Project Design – Sustainability – Pages 11 – 18).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 15

Adequacy of resources - Adequacy of resources

- 1. The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources for the proposed extension project. In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed extension project, the Secretary considers the relevance and demonstrated commitment of each partner in the proposed project to the implementation and success of the project during the extension period.**

Strengths:

The applicant presents a cradle to career pipeline of services that offer a variety of community childcare partnerships that will build upon the existing program and assist in preparing students for kindergarten through books provided to children and parents for ages birth through age five. The program's summer enrichment camps ensure students receive instructional training year-round. Children, ages 3 to 8, with communication deficiencies receive speech and vocabulary training that prepares them with the foundational communication skills for kindergarten and first-grade. The project's home visitation program by trained staff encourages parental instruction and involvement in prenatal health care and continuous child development. The program's outreach programs for teenagers educate them on the importance of abstinence, thus reducing teenage pregnancies and sexually transmitted diseases. Support programs geared at encouraging parents to become more involved in school programs and to become homeowners, which positively impacts their lives and communities. (Figure B.1. How the Indianola Promise Community Works. page 2)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 15

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/11/2018 01:51 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/11/2018 01:51 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Delta Health Alliance, Inc. (U215N180011)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Strength of demonstrated performance		
Strength of demonstrated performance		
1. Demonstrated performance	50	50
Sub Total	50	50
Quality of project design		
Quality of project design		
1. Project design	20	20
Sub Total	20	20
Quality of the management plan		
Quality of the management plan		
1. Management Plan	15	15
Sub Total	15	15
Adequacy of resources		
Adequacy of resources		
1. Adequacy of resources	15	15
Sub Total	15	15
Total	100	100

Technical Review Form

Panel #6 - Promise Neighborhoods Extension Grants - 6: 84.215N

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Delta Health Alliance, Inc. (U215N180011)

Questions

Strength of demonstrated performance - Strength of demonstrated performance

1. The Secretary considers the extent to which the applicant demonstrates, based on performance in its implementation grant, the following:
 - (i) the ability to collect, track, and report GPRA data on performance indicators established by the Department and required to be reported on annually as part of the initial implementation grant;
 - (ii) the most positive and promising results during its initial implementation grant based on such indicators, emphasizing getting children ready to learn; and
 - (iii) a commitment to operating in the most underserved and under-resourced, including rural, areas.In addition to the applicant's narrative response to sub-criterion (i), the applicant must include GPRA data on Department-established performance indicators as described above and a summary of the initial implementation grant for Appendix A – PN GPRA Data and Implementation Grant Summary.

Strengths:

(i) The applicant presented an adequate plan to collect, track, and report GPRA data on performance indicators. The applicant stated that the Indianola Promise Community (IPC) will use Social Solutions' Efforts to Outcomes (ETO) as the longitudinal database alongside the Results Scorecard to track participants from program to program (p. e17). The applicant stated the Delta Health Alliance enrolls participants in the regional common data system accessible by partner programs and participants in the ETO (p. e17). Each participant in the system is provided a unique identification to aid in the tracking process (p. e17).

(ii) The applicant provided a discussion regarding the most positive and promising results during the implementation grant emphasizing getting children ready to learn (p. e85). For example, the applicant explained that the Mississippi Department of Education (MDE) changed state assessment for math and ELA twice since the full implementation of IPC began in 2013 in 2015 making the test more rigorous (p. e30). The applicant stated that the Literacy Fellows program provided targeted intervention for students who score below the 25th percentile on the beginning of year reading assessment and who are at-risk of grade retention (p. 31). The applicant stated goal was that 75% percent of IPC Literacy Fellows participants will pass the third-grade reading gate on their first try (p. e44).

(iii). The applicant demonstrated the commitment to operating in the most underserved and under-resourced, including rural, within the service area there are high levels of poverty. The applicant provided a description of the area where households in the service area earns just \$26,479 a year compared to the median income in Mississippi of \$40,528 (p. e36). Furthermore, 32.3% of households in Indianola receive SNAP benefits compared to 18.0% of Mississippi households and 13.0% nationwide (p. e37). Lastly, the applicant noted that Indianola's Sunflower County is ranked 19th nation-wide in a listing of rural counties with the highest poverty (p. e37). Given the condition of the service area, the Indianola Promise Community remain committed to increasing educational performance. For example, the applicant reported that under the IPC, kindergarten readiness improved from 25% to 64% (p. e17). The applicant noted that there were significant educational improvements in the elementary school STAR math and reading assessments and high school graduation rates (p. e17).

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 50

Quality of project design - Quality of project design

- 1. The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed extension project. In determining the quality of the proposed extension project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**
 - (i) the extent to which the applicant proposes continuing to pursue ambitious goals during the proposed project; and**
 - (ii) the extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.**

Strengths:

(i)The applicant has provided a complete plan that demonstrates a continued pursuit of ambitious goals during the proposed project. The applicant stated that its efforts to pursue ambitious goals during the proposed project will include the Linking Individuals Neighborhoods and Kids to Services (LINKS) system (p. e38). The applicant explained that the collaborative system is part of Indianola Promise Community's management system designed to address issues relating to academics, behavior, attendance, poverty, housing, and employment for families of students in targeted schools (p. e38). For example, the LINK process will enable the enrolled Indianola families to support their child's academic and development goals by linking the family head of household to other Indianola Promise Community programs such as the Social Services (p. e106). Furthermore IPC train women who were recruited from the local community as outreach workers to visit pregnant women and families with young children up to five years of age to promote healthy living and self-sufficiency (p. e40). The services through outreach aid in improving children's development and to promote school readiness (p. e40). (ii) The goals, objectives, milestones, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable (p. e105-129). For example, to achieve the goal of strengthening family resilience for residents of Indianola with children ages 0-18, applicant explained that the PAT educators (Parents and Teachers) provide education on recognizing and treating perinatal depression in group visits and through peer-support meetings (p. e109-110). The timeline to achieve this goal went from July 1, 2018 to September 30 2018 (p. e109-110).

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 20

Quality of the management plan - Quality of the management plan

- 1. The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed extension project. In determining the quality of the management plan for the proposed extension project, the Secretary considers the adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.**

Strengths:

The applicant presented a comprehensive management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project. The applicant stated the Delta Health Alliance is governed by a five-member board, which will provide oversight over the Indianola Promise Community (IPC) initiative (p. e54-55). The applicant presented a table with the name, expertise, public service, networks and represented sectors of the Board of Directors (p. e55). The applicant noted that the IPC has an Advisory Board that consists of 13 members who reside in the service area (p. e56). The Advisory Board receives reports and presentations regarding progress regarding each of the 15 GPRA indicators (p. e56). The IPC has an Accountability Committee that reports to the Advisory Group that ensures Promise Neighborhood supported interventions are addressing and removing barriers to the community that impede their progress (p. e57). The applicant provided a chart highlighting milestones, activities, responsible person/agency, benchmarks, and timelines (p. e105-129).

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 15

Adequacy of resources - Adequacy of resources

- 1. The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources for the proposed extension project. In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed extension project, the Secretary considers the relevance and demonstrated commitment of each partner in the proposed project to the implementation and success of the project during the extension period.**

Strengths:

The applicant provided a thorough discussion regarding the resources to operate the project during the extension period of the grant. The applicant presented information regarding resource commitments of the entities partnering with the Promise Neighborhood initiative. For example, City of Indianola, through the Mayor's office, is committed to \$5,000 each year of in-kind matching contributions for staff, public spaces, supplies and volunteer staff (p. e72). Furthermore, the IPC created the Social Services Collaborative (SSC) which is made up of local, state and federal resource agency representatives that assist children and families (p. e59). The applicant listed all commitment/resources in the table for Active Partners (p. e70). The list was comprehensive addressing the social, educational, health, housing, and finance needs of the population being served (p. e70). There was also a Memorandum of Understanding document attached to confirm commitments (p e.243).

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 15

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/11/2018 01:51 PM