# Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Cuyahoga County Office of Early Childhood (S419C170004)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Points Scored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Selection Criteria</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Need for Project</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of the Preschool Program Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of the Preschool Program Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Quality of Program Design</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preschool PFS Partnership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preschool PFS Partnership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Preschool PFS Partnership</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of the Work Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of the Work Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Quality of the Work Plan</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of the Project Leadership and Team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of the Project Leadership and Team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Quality of Leadership</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Narrative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Narrative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Budget Narrative</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Priority Questions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive Preference Priority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive Preference Priority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Competitive Priority</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolute Priority – Feasibility Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolute Priority – Feasibility Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Absolute Priority</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Points Possible</td>
<td>Points Scored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolute Priority – Feasibility Study</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Absolute Priority</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions

Selection Criteria - Need for Project

1. The Secretary will consider the needs of the Target Population. In determining the need for the proposed project, the Secretary will consider the magnitude of the need of the Target Population for the services to be provided by a potential PFS project. Applicants should clearly state and demonstrate the extent of the problem facing the Target Population using data and other relevant information.

Strengths:
The applicant provides a thorough description of their Target Population and their specific unmet need for preschool services. Specifically they note their intent to target preschool children ages 3-5 years of age who are at or below 300% of the Federal Poverty Level (FPL) and who have not yet benefitted from access to the County UPK program. Their proposed project will bring research proven effective programming developed in the State of Ohio to scale to ensure all children including those most at risk have "seats" in their universal preschool programs. The applicant notes that though the expansion is planned, fewer than 30 percent of low-income preschool-aged children in Cuyahoga County will be provided with their proven high quality and effective preschool model.

The applicant provides relevant statistical information to describe their Target Population and effectively demonstrate an unmet need they will impact with their planned PFS project.

Weaknesses:
None noted

Reader's Score: 10

Quality of the Preschool Program Design - Quality of the Preschool Program Design

1. The Secretary will consider the quality of the design of the proposed preschool program. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed preschool program, the Secretary will consider the extent to which the intervention strategy is likely to improve student outcomes for the Target Population, based on quantitative, qualitative, or theoretical evidence, including the extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable and will demonstrate student success. In responding to this criterion, applicants should identify clearly specified and measurable outcomes for the preschool program and explain how these outcomes can be achieved by the program. While these outcomes will inform the selection of Outcome Measures for the PFS project, they do not limit a grantee from evaluating additional Outcome Measures in the course of completing the Preschool PFS Feasibility Study.

Strengths:
The applicant describes a thorough process by which their stakeholder group assessed needs and designed a research and evidence informed high quality preschool program. Using this model, the applicant proposes to scale up to serve the unmet needs of their identified Target Population.

The model described includes high quality benchmarks of child development programming that includes curriculum and assessment, ongoing professional development, continuous quality improvement, and a strong family engagement and
support system integrated. This represents a comprehensive and quality approach to Preschool programming to serve as the foundation for their PFS study.

As part of their program design the applicant notes the use of a mixed model of preschool programming to further meet the unique needs of children, families, and community. The applicant offers specific evaluation evidence conducted by Case Western University Reserve that confirms the effectiveness of the approach they are proposing.

The applicant presents a thorough description of their outcome measures and expectations that include: kindergarten readiness, on-time grade matriculation, third-grade reading proficiency, and improved executive functioning. They further describe the process they will use to randomly review mid and long term impacts leveraging existing ongoing research and evaluation studies.

The applicant describes short, mid and long term outcome goals and measures. These include their statewide Kindergarten Readiness Assessment, Third Grade Reading scores and Grade progression and retention rates. It is significant and impressive that the multiple measures and assessments noted exist within a wider network of evaluation and assessment of child outcomes that will serve to inform the impact of the proposed preschool programming. The capacity to do this as presented by the applicant is a strength and supports the ability of the proposed feasibility study to inform the early education field.

The applicant impressively describes 4 reliable and valid instruments they will select from to measure executive function outcomes. These include: The Devereux Early Childhood Assessment (DECA), Head-Toes-Knees-Shoulders, The Behavior Rating Inventory of Executive Functioning – Preschool Version (BRIEF-P), The Social Skills Improvement System (SSIS). The use of thesemeasure have potential not just to impact this study but the work of others in the field working toward similar outcomes.

Weaknesses:
None noted

Reader's Score: 25

Preschool PFS Partnership - Preschool PFS Partnership

1. The Secretary will consider the quality of the Preschool PFS Partnership. In evaluating a Preschool PFS Partnership, the Secretary will consider the following:

Reader's Score: 25

Sub Question
1. (c)(1) The quality of an existing Preschool PFS Partnership, including the history of the collaboration, or, if a Preschool PFS Partnership does not exist, the quality of the plan to form a Preschool PFS Partnership.

Strengths:
The applicant describes a strong and historically proven partnership referred to as Invest in Children now known as the Partnership Council is comprised on public and private partners that includes the State Office of Early Education as well as PNC Bank. They also describe their prior partnership as a Pay For Success Partner working with Foster Care systems.

The applicant further notes that they consider parents as important partners and have partnered with national
organizations notably the Johns Hopkins National Network of Partnership Schools which they note has earned them awards for their unique engagement and outreach to fathers.

The applicant intends to use the successful team that guided their prior PFS project to use their lessons learned to accelerate the success of this proposed PFS project. The applicant thoroughly describes a 7 member team that will serve in an advisory capacity. Each member described brings experience and expertise to the table.

Weaknesses:
None noted

Reader’s Score: 15

2. (c)(2) The extent to which the roles and responsibilities of members or proposed members of a Preschool PFS Partnership are clearly described and are appropriate and sufficient to successfully implement a PFS project.

Strengths:
The applicant provides a detailed listing of those who will contribute toward the successful completion of their Preschool PFS project. The 7 member team as described offer significant and relevant experience that will provide informed and relevant guidance for the proposed feasibility study. This partnership is appropriate and more than sufficient and will significantly enhance the applicant's likelihood of success in developing a meaningful approach to their project. Examples of the comprehensive breadth this team offers include child development expertise, early education and programming experience, family support systems and private funding sources with a focus of support for young children.

Weaknesses:
None noted

Reader’s Score: 10

Quality of the Work Plan - Quality of the Work Plan

The Secretary will consider the quality of the work plan. In determining the quality of the work plan, the Secretary will consider the following factors:

Reader’s Score: 23

Sub Question

1. (d)(1) The adequacy of the work plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed Feasibility Study project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks on time. Applicants should identify whether a contractor will conduct the Feasibility Study and, if appropriate, the extent to which the timeline for selecting and hiring the contractor is reasonable and sufficient for completing the project on time and within budget.
Sub Question

Strengths:
The applicant provides an extensive description of how they will proceed with an informed work plan that will likely lead to a successful PFS project. Their project is built upon a solid foundation that demonstrates they understand the scope of work needed, a strong understanding of what they intend to do, and a clear understanding of the outcomes they hope to achieve. This strong foundation supports an ability to be successful. They also describe how they will leverage the success of a prior PFS project to accelerate their proposed project.

The applicant provides an extensive and complete timeline that clearly presents what will be done and when. Their logic model offers further insights into what they intend to do, why, and results expected.

A specific and experience Feasibility Study contractor is identified by name and it is noted they have experience leading over 50 feasibility studies, including 14 studies through a federal grant.

Weaknesses:
None noted

Reader’s Score: 12

2. (d)(2) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring stakeholder feedback in the operation of the proposed Preschool PFS Feasibility Pilot. If the Feasibility Study includes the reduction in special education placement as a Financial Benefit, the extent to which the work plan includes outreach to and involvement of the representatives from the State and local special education community or individuals with special education expertise, including groups representing families.

Strengths:
The applicant provides a detailed plan in which their Advisory committee will meet regularly meet and provide input to inform the ongoing work of the PFS project. This group will be offered input by the Work Streams described by the applicant and this includes one dedicated to Interventions and Outcomes and another dedicated to more pragmatics such as Contracts and Economics. The applicant provides detail of the composition of each group and what they will do. As described in detail, stakeholders will have regular, time specified, and meaningful opportunity to offer input and suggestions to continuously contribute their thoughts and ideas that will in turn, support achieving project goals.

Weaknesses:
None noted

Reader’s Score: 10

3. (d)(3) The extent to which the time commitments of the project director and team and other key project personnel are appropriate and adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project.

Strengths:
Within the applicant's budget narrative time allocations are provided for key personnel. Detail is provided for the key Contractual partners of Third Sector and the Poverty Center.

Weaknesses:
It is unclear if the time commitments of the key project personnel is sufficient. The Leadership seems limited and spread out. It may be difficult to pull together strong leadership with the limited time noted. For example Leadership is presented in three positions described as Project Lead at .30 FTE, Project Leader .05 FTE, and Relationship Manager at .03 FTE. This represents less than 100% FTE dedicated to leadership and being spread out across 3
Sub Question

positions within 2 contractual partners may be ineffective.

While the applicant may have strong alliances with working partners that operate efficiently leading them to propose the limited and shared leadership noted a clearer description of how this will be sufficient is needed to further support this approach.

Reader’s Score: 1

Quality of the Project Leadership and Team - Quality of the Project Leadership and Team

1. The Secretary will consider the quality of the project leadership and team. The Secretary will consider the extent to which the applicant has the project and financial management experience necessary to manage the Preschool PFS Feasibility Pilot, including:

Reader’s Score: 5

Sub Question

1. (e)(1) Managing and overseeing similar projects (e.g., PFS or other project related work, experience with early childhood education) with specific examples of prior accomplishments and outcomes; and

Strengths:
The applicant describes strong experience among their partnership in effectively implementing a prior PFS project as well as successfully implementing early childhood programs within their state. They document extensive experience within their partnership of grant facilitation and program management of similar work. This experience is specific to those identified through their contract providers.

Weaknesses:
None noted

Reader’s Score: 3

2. (e)(2) Managing Federal grants, including plans for ensuring compliance with Federal guidelines.

Strengths:
The applicant documents their prior successful experience in implementing Federal grants with noted compliance to relevant guidelines. This successful experience includes work with the Department of Education and Health and Human Services with programs designed to meet the needs of at risk children and families such as Head Start.

Weaknesses:
None noted

Reader’s Score: 2

Budget Narrative - Budget Narrative

1. The Secretary will consider the adequacy of resources necessary to complete the Feasibility Study, including any philanthropic or other resources that may be contributed toward the project. In determining the adequacy of resources, the Secretary will consider the extent to which the budget will
adequately support program activities and achieve desired outputs and outcomes.

Strengths:
The applicant provides a detailed justification and rationale for how they will spend the funds requested should they receive a grant award. All aspects described within their proposal are found within this budget justification. Allocated amounts seem reasonable and justifiable for their intended purposes as described within the PFS proposal.

Weaknesses:
None noted

Reader's Score: 10

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority

1. Competitive Priority: Outcome Measures Across Various Domains
   To meet this priority, an applicant must propose a Feasibility Study to evaluate if PFS is viable that would evaluate social and emotional or Executive Functioning Outcome Measures, or both. These potential outcome measures may be predictive of future school success, cost savings, cost avoidance, and other societal benefits, and may appropriate to include in a PFS project. (up to 5 points)

   Strengths:
The applicant provides a clear and well thought out approach to assess Executive Functioning Outcomes. They both identify and detail 4 valid and reliable, research proven potential tools they will select from to measure these important outcomes.

   Weaknesses:
None noted

Reader's Score: 5

Absolute Priority – Feasibility Study - Absolute Priority – Feasibility Study

1. Under this priority, the applicant must propose a Feasibility Study that will determine the viability of using a PFS approach to expand or improve a preschool program for a Target Population, and describe the potential Outcome Measures the applicant proposes to identify and evaluate for appropriateness for PFS. Any applicant that includes a Feasibility Study for a PFS project that proposes to reduce the need for special education and related services as an Outcome Measure must also include at least one other meaningful and substantive Outcome Measure of short-, medium-, or longterm student achievement, such as kindergarten readiness, reading and math growth or achievement, and improved social and emotional skills.

   Yes

Reader's Score: 0
Absolute Priority – Feasibility Study - Absolute Priority – Feasibility Study

1. Under this priority, the applicant must propose a Feasibility Study that will determine the viability of using a PFS approach to expand or improve a preschool program for a Target Population, and describe the potential Outcome Measures the applicant proposes to identify and evaluate for appropriateness for PFS. Any applicant that includes a Feasibility Study for a PFS project that proposes to reduce the need for special education and related services as an Outcome Measure must also include at least one other meaningful and substantive Outcome Measure of short-, medium-, or longterm student achievement, such as kindergarten readiness, reading and math growth or achievement, and improved social and emotional skills.

Strengths:

Specific outcome measures are provided that will be used to assess outcomes short, medium, and long term. These are embedded within the statewide system of early education and the public school system data collection systems.

In total, the applicant provides a strong plan and clearly have experience with a feasibility study. Throughout their proposal they have applied this experience to the Preschool Feasibility Study they propose. They have developed a strong proposal that builds on this feasibility experience and their state's robust early childhood initiatives and progress in such a way that suggests a high likelihood of developing a successful final plan as per the recommendations and lessons learned from their feasibility study.

Weaknesses:

none noted

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
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## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Cuyahoga County Office of Early Childhood (S419C170004)  
**Reader #2:** **********

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Points Scored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Selection Criteria</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for Project</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Need for Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality of the Preschool Program Design</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of the Preschool Program Design</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Quality of Program Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preschool PFS Partnership</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preschool PFS Partnership</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Preschool PFS Partnership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality of the Work Plan</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of the Work Plan</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Quality of the Work Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality of the Project Leadership and Team</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of the Project Leadership and Team</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Quality of Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget Narrative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Narrative</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Budget Narrative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Priority Questions</strong></td>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
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</tr>
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### Absolute Priority – Feasibility Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub Total</th>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Points Scored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Absolute Priority</th>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Points Scored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub Total</th>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Points Scored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Points Scored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Technical Review Form

Panel #4 - PFS Panel - 4: 84.419C

Reader #2: **********
Applicant: Cuyahoga County Office of Early Childhood (S419C170004)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Need for Project

1. The Secretary will consider the needs of the Target Population. In determining the need for the proposed project, the Secretary will consider the magnitude of the need of the Target Population for the services to be provided by a potential PFS project. Applicants should clearly state and demonstrate the extent of the problem facing the Target Population using data and other relevant information.

Strengths:

The applicant articulates a comprehensive overview of the needs of the target population, adequately citing reference sources to substantiate the need. The problem facing the target population are factors encompassing poverty and the demand for high quality preschool programs. The proposed initiative is focused on expanding Cuyahoga County Universal Pre-K program as a critical priority of the lead agency and their collaborative public/private partnerships. The Preschool Feasibility Study is focused to target preschool children ages 3-5 who are below 300% of the Federal Poverty level and who have not yet benefited from access to the County PK program.

Data from the US Census Bureau Census of 2010 and 2010-2014 ACS 5 Year Estimates document need to provide services to an additional 33,660 preschool children. The gap between demand and capacity is clearly articulated and focus on advancing the current serves to become truly “universal” for all children at or below 300% of the FPL. In addition, it is references that currently 70% of child care in the target County is of unknown or low quality. It is asserted that the quality of these programs are proposed to increase based on state statues.

The applicant precisely describes their program, Invest in Children as in collaboration with Starting Point – the State – designated child care resource and referral agency. It is identified more assistance is needed to further accelerate the drive to prove high quality preschool for all youth. It is recognized by the applicant that their current services have made progress, and also acknowledge the need to reach greater numbers of youth. The Preschool Feasibility Study is proposed to help the community test and refine strategies to address the gap. Well-developed charts of data are presented which substantiate the narration of need. The charts clearly outline the supply of preschool services, identifying 70% as unrated or lower quality as compared to high quality supply.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses are noted.

Reader’s Score: 10

Quality of the Preschool Program Design - Quality of the Preschool Program Design

The Secretary will consider the quality of the design of the proposed preschool program. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed preschool program, the Secretary will consider the extent to which the intervention strategy is likely to improve student outcomes for the Target Population, based on quantitative, qualitative, or theoretical evidence, including the extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable and will demonstrate student success. In responding to this criterion, applicants should identify clearly
specified and measurable outcomes for the preschool program and explain how these outcomes can be achieved by the program. While these outcomes will inform the selection of Outcome Measures for the PFS project, they do not limit a grantee from evaluating additional Outcome Measures in the course of completing the Preschool PFS Feasibility Study.

Strengths:

The applicant presents a well-developed comprehensive program design to expand current successful programs to address the needs of preschool youth in the target population. The propose initiative encompasses a wide scope of intervention strategies which appear highly likely to continue to improve outcomes for students in the target population, including youth challenged with disabilities and dual language barriers. The proposed program is well documented as researched and evidenced-based and includes quantitative, qualitative, or theoretical evidence. Program goals, objectives, and outcomes are clearly specified and measurable and structured to leverage strategies and resources which will demonstrate student success. The goal of the proposed program, UPK 2.0 is goal focused to service children with special needs, and engage families and advance currently successfully preschool operations aimed at a universal design to outreach and enroll all eligible 3,4,5 year old in the County at or below 300% poverty line.

The proposed Pay for Success is structure to build on and improve a highly successful model currently in operation and which will demonstrate the benefits of accountability and researched based program design. The proposed initiative will expand the initial program which began in 2007, and will continue to its goal focused operations. The goal is well developed and encompasses: making a "gold standard" for preschool experiences for the target population; pursue the highest quality possible in early learning programs for the County; drive higher rates of school readiness and make quality programs more affordable for the target population.

The applicant copiously narrates the program design specifically outlining the seven standards, their research base and ongoing monitoring and evaluation data to substantiate its success. For example, the Case Western Reserve Unified Center on Urban Poverty and Community Development (Poverty Center conducted a program evaluation which conclude that the pilot program demonstrated significantly significant gains in school readiness over the course of the year. The data from this evaluation are clearly detailed.

It is significant that the program, Invest in Children, employs a mixed delivery system in a variety of setting including publically funded Head Stat sites, private day care and in-home family child care. While the applicant describes their programs and services at of high-quality, it is specified that 70% of other preschool programs are not of this quality.

The eight steps to attain high quality rating are clearly delineated. These encompass implementation of research based curriculum to parent involvement to staff professional development. The program is identify as research based and gleaning evidenced from several large scale programs in other states. The results of these students are included in the addition to addressing academic gains and also to serving the whole child.

The fundamental goal of the program is specified to invest in the quality of care in participating sites to enhance childe outcomes. The applicant identifies recognizing the varying needs of early learners and enables sites to choose their own curriculum which must meet nine high standards. These include: documentation as research based, integration language with math and science, incorporation of family involvement and encompass on going evaluation. A well-developed approach to serving the special needs youth is well developed and encompasses innovative intervention. For example, the employment of a Technical Assistance Specialists who comes into the classroom to assist in program effectiveness. The Technical Assistance Specialist Assistance is education in mental health and early childhood and assistance with student behavior and medical attention. A Special Needs Intensive Model is included in the proposed initiative to engage their services over a longer period of time in the classroom to ensure teacher' mastery of skills to maintain a stable effective environment.

The proposed initiative also encompasses linkage within the ChildHood Integrates Longitudinal Dada (CHILD) System, maintained by the Poverty Center. Wherein information can be used for planning monitoring and evaluation to improve children’s health and wellbeing. The linkage to records across time and systems enable a longitudinal data system in which children are observed and documents when they are engaged in one of the 20 administrative systems that compose CHILD. An exhibit is precisely developed delineating the components of the CHILD System. An extensive
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evaluation plan is comprehensive and well-articulated, detailing four specific programs that could be used to assess student growth and development. Pages 16, 17

Weaknesses:
None are noted

Reader's Score: 25

Preschool PFS Partnership - Preschool PFS Partnership

1. The Secretary will consider the quality of the Preschool PFS Partnership. In evaluating a Preschool PFS Partnership, the Secretary will consider the following:

Reader's Score: 23

Sub Question

1. (c)(1) The quality of an existing Preschool PFS Partnership, including the history of the collaboration, or, if a Preschool PFS Partnership does not exist, the quality of the plan to form a Preschool PFS Partnership.

Strengths:
The applicant effectively narrates a strong composite of existing Preschool PFS Partnership and extensively details an impressive history of collaboration. The applicant organization narrates an overview of a 17 year history of public/private partnerships engaged in Cuyahoga County’s Universal Pre-K (UPK) identifying that in 1999 leaders of the County government joined with private sector leaders in business and philanthropy to create a public/private partnership – Invest in Children. The goal of the partnership in the Invest in Children initiative was to create a high quality, comprehensive early childhood system of services for youth ages prenatal to age 5 and to build community awareness of the importance of healthy early childhood development. Focused to specifically address the needs of disadvantaged youth, the proposed initiative advances a PFS Feasibility Study partnership to build upon long term relationship to advance services for the target population in the County. A substantial history of working with Pay for Success is identified in noting that Cuyahoga County was the first government in the United Stated to develop and launch a Pay for Success project – Partnering for Family Success, launched in 2015. Program partners identified include staff representing; the Cuyahoga County as the project lead (specifically the Office of Early Childhood), the Third Sector Capital Partners (as technical advisor and Case Western Reserve University’ Center for Urban Poverty and Community Development (as evaluators.)

A Pay for Success Advisory Committee is proposed to be developed to enhance the program development and implementation. Each member is identified by name and affiliation. They include staff from the: Office of Early Learning and School Readiness-Ohio Department of Education, the George Gund Foundation, Ohio Child Care Resources and Referral Association, Starting Point Resources and Referral Agency Cuyahoga County Division of Job and Family Services and a PNC Bank chairperson.

Weaknesses:
No weaknesses are noted.
2. (c)(2) The extent to which the roles and responsibilities of members or proposed members of a Preschool PFS Partnership are clearly described and are appropriate and sufficient to successfully implement a PFS project.

**Strengths:**

The applicant identifies that the same successful team who have guided the Partnering for Family Success project, a Preschool Feasibility Study currently in operation, will serve to lead the proposed initiative. The budget section provide brief information to identify the roles and responsibilities. In the work plan section the applicant identifies that the study will be led by the Third Sector Capital Partners Inc. and managed through a collaborative governance structure. The Poverty Center is also noted to lead the study components in regard to Data Assessment and Access and Outcome Matrices and evaluation.

In the budget section it is identified that a Director/Relationship Manager will serve to oversee the project, including managing the designed Project Lead and to support the project. The Project Lead is identified with the responsibility to execute the work plan and serve as the day-to-day contact per the project partners. A Project Support is identified to support the execution of the work plan and create key deliverables and Subject Matter Experts are also listed to provide expertise for specific work streams.

The Advisory Committee is specified to meet bi-weekly and responsible for the oversight of the project visioning, through partnerships with working groups and also responsible for trouble shooting.

**Weaknesses:**

Adequate information is narrating the responsibilities of members for the proposed Preschool PFS Partnership to determine if they are appropriate and sufficient to successfully implement a PFS project. Information gleaned from the Work Plan and the Budget Narrative to describe the leadership team is confusing. For example, a Project Lead is identified from the Third Sector Partners, and in the CWRU Poverty Center Contract a Project Leader is identified. Their roles and responsibilities lack an adequate description.

In addition the applicant asserts that the leadership team involved in the current Pay for Success program will serve to lead the proposed program. However, information on this leadership team is not described to note their adequacy in leading the proposed initiative.

**Quality of the Work Plan - Quality of the Work Plan**

The Secretary will consider the quality of the work plan. In determining the quality of the work plan, the Secretary will consider the following factors:
**Sub Question**

milestones for accomplishing project tasks on time. Applicants should identify whether a contractor will conduct the Feasibility Study and, if appropriate, the extent to which the timeline for selecting and hiring the contractor is reasonable and sufficient for completing the project on time and within budget.

**Strengths:**
The applicant copiously narrates a well-developed work plan which appears well positioned to achieve the objectives of the proposed Feasibility Study project, noted in defining responsibilities, a timeline, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks on time. Contractors are identified to be hired conduct the Feasibility Study. The applicant address their endeavor to work with current policies and to specify the contractors to be hired for the project, prior to the award. Adequate components of the work plan are noted specifically in identifying five comprehensive program goals. The goals are well developed and encompass determining the community’s capacity for expansion of the current program beyond 4,000 slots and evaluating child development outcomes both cognitive and social/emotional. It is also specified that the program is goal focused to create a cost/benefit analysis and economic model based upon program outcomes.

A well-developed timeline proposed program 30 month calendar an, clearly identifying general areas of responsibilities is charted and highlighted as divided among the Third Sector and the Poverty Center. Eight areas of development, implantation and evaluation are effectively narrated. These components span the kick off to reporting to stakeholders and to a vast network across the country. It is asserted that once the project is awarded and completed that the applicant organization intends to reach out to other Departments of Education to leverage work they have completed.

It is significant that the proposal identifies an Initial Funder Assessment to work with national and local funding steams to support the initiative. Outcomes appear to be structured to be effectively assessed using multiple approaches.

**Weaknesses:**
Information is lacking to discuss effective strategies and procedures to ensure the program activities are accomplished within budget. For example, the person or position responsible for the budget is not clearly identified and discussed.

**Reader’s Score:** 12

2. (d)(2) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring stakeholder feedback in the operation of the proposed Preschool PFS Feasibility Pilot. If the Feasibility Study includes the reduction in special education placement as a Financial Benefit, the extent to which the work plan includes outreach to and involvement of the representatives from the State and local special education community or individuals with special education expertise, including groups representing families.

**Strengths:**
An Advisory Committee is mentioned to provide insight. Parental engagement is also noted. Both appear likely venues to secure stakeholder feedback. Multiple partners and their departments ensure varied layers through which feedback will be secured.

**Weaknesses:**
None are noted.

**Reader’s Score:** 10
3. (d)(3) The extent to which the time commitments of the project director and team and other key project personnel are appropriate and adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project.

Strengths:
The applicant clearly identifies the time commitment of the project director and key staff. In addition, two contractors are well detailed in time and services dedicated to the Study. One Project Leader is specified to serve as .06% FTE from one contractor and the other as .05% FTE from a second contractor.

Weaknesses:
Adequate information is lacking to substantiate that the time commitment of key personnel is appropriate and adequate to meet the program objectives. For example, in the Budget Narrative, it is specified that the Project Director/Relationship Manager will serve the program from the Third Sector and dedicate .06% FTE to the project. In addition, a Project Leader from the Poverty Center is also noted and will dedicate .05%FTE to the project. The time adequacy of these positions are not described as adequate.

Reader’s Score: 2

Quality of the Project Leadership and Team - Quality of the Project Leadership and Team

1. The Secretary will consider the quality of the project leadership and team. The Secretary will consider the extent to which the applicant has the project and financial management experience necessary to manage the Preschool PFS Feasibility Pilot, including:

Strengths:
In consideration of a comprehensive narration of the Leadership team, it appears the team demonstrates a high level of expertise and extensive experience. In the Project Leadership section it is identified that the project will be managed by the Office of Early Childhood/Invest In Children. A staff member from the office is named and her expertise and experience are extensively detailed including her years in overseeing successful pre school programs and working on relevant evaluation teams. Prior accomplishments of the three entities in collaborate leadership in the management team are copiously detailed.

The applicant identifies that the feasibility study will be led by the Director of the Third Sector Capital Partners Inc. and his team. The success of the Third Sector is well documented noting experience and success including a grant from the Corporation of National and Community Service to deliver a Pre School Feasibility technical assistance and feasibility assessment to government inters in performance based solutions.

The applicant clearly identifies the Case Western Reserve University Center on Urban Poverty and Community Development (the Poverty Center) as a key partner. The Co-Director of the Poverty Center is specified as designated to lead the data and outcomes analysis work stream. It is noted that the Poverty Center has served the applicant organization since 2001 as an evaluator of early childhood services.
2. (e)(2) Managing Federal grants, including plans for ensuring compliance with Federal guidelines.

Strengths:
The applicant effectively narrates extensive experience of the leadership team entities in managing grants. It is specified that the Office of Early Childhood, the lead agency, has received and successfully managed for US Department of Education grants during the past ten years. It is noted that three of the four grants focused on preschool program design and implementation. It is noted that no compliance issue had been found in the evaluation of any of the federal grants managed.

One of the program partners, the Third Sector is noted for their experience in managing grants. This is evidenced in the 2014 award of a $1.9 million grant for the Corporation for National and Community Service's Social Innovation Fund to deliver PFS technical assistance and feasibility assessments to governments interested in performance-based solutions.

Weaknesses:
Information is lacking to describe current plans for ensuring compliance with Federal guidelines.

Budget Narrative - Budget Narrative

1. The Secretary will consider the adequacy of resources necessary to complete the Feasibility Study, including any philanthropic or other resources that may be contributed toward the project. In determining the adequacy of resources, the Secretary will consider the extent to which the budget will adequately support program activities and achieve desired outputs and outcomes.

Strengths:
The applicant effectively describes an adequacy of resources which are necessary to complete the Feasibility Study, including any philanthropic or other resources that may be contributed toward the project. The program budget includes funds for this grant proposal matched to extensive matching funds and in-kind donation of service, which in total appear adequate to support program activities and achieve desired outputs and outcomes. An exemplary component of the grant program is the establishment of a Sustainability Committee of representatives from the Partnership Council. Grant funding from the Department of Education is to be combined with in-kind staff support from the County office which is sufficient to deliver output and outcomes of the program. In addition, two national organization are identified for in-kind support including the Urban Institute and the National Head Start Association. In addition, the program will leverage the expertise and resources of the Third Sector and the Poverty Center and of the County and the CHID Data system.

Weaknesses:
None are noted
Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority

1. Competitive Priority: Outcome Measures Across Various Domains
   To meet this priority, an applicant must propose a Feasibility Study to evaluate if PFS is viable that
   would evaluate social and emotional or Executive Functioning Outcome Measures, or both. These
   potential outcome measures may be predictive of future school success, cost savings, cost avoidance,
   and other societal benefits, and may appropriate to include in a PFS project. (up to 5 points)

   Strengths:
   The applicant effectively addresses the competitive preference priority in a program design that evaluates social and
   emotional early childhood development of youth and Executive Functioning Outcome Measures. The program evaluation
   model is structured to examine the relationship between executive functioning and kindergarten readiness. Four
   measurements are in consideration stage prior to a selection of one. The one measure selected will have the ability to be
   employed in various setting and demonstrate its usability and it predictive ability in relation to kindergarten readiness.

   Weaknesses:
   None are noted.

   Reader's Score: 5

Absolute Priority – Feasibility Study - Absolute Priority – Feasibility Study

1. Under this priority, the applicant must propose a Feasibility Study that will determine the viability of
   using a PFS approach to expand or improve a preschool program for a Target Population, and describe
   the potential Outcome Measures the applicant proposes to identify and evaluate for appropriateness for
   PFS. Any applicant that includes a Feasibility Study for a PFS project that proposes to reduce the need
   for special education and related services as an Outcome Measure must also include at least one other
   meaningful and substantive Outcome Measure of short-, medium-, or longterm student achievement,
   such as kindergarten readiness, reading and math growth or achievement, and improved social and
   emotional skills.

   Yes

   Reader's Score: 0

Absolute Priority – Feasibility Study - Absolute Priority – Feasibility Study

1. Under this priority, the applicant must propose a Feasibility Study that will determine the viability of
   using a PFS approach to expand or improve a preschool program for a Target Population, and describe
   the potential Outcome Measures the applicant proposes to identify and evaluate for appropriateness for
   PFS. Any applicant that includes a Feasibility Study for a PFS project that proposes to reduce the need
   for special education and related services as an Outcome Measure must also include at least one other
   meaningful and substantive Outcome Measure of short-, medium-, or longterm student achievement,
   such as kindergarten readiness, reading and math growth or achievement, and improved social and
   emotional skills.

   Strengths:
   Overall, the applicant proposes a Feasibility Study that will determine the viability of using a PFS approach to expand the
   current preschool program for the target population. It is clearly specified and well articulated that the proposed project
will build on existing partnerships and experience in Preschool Feasibility Studies.

Weaknesses:
None are noted.

Reader's Score: 0
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Technical Review Form

Panel #4 - PFS Panel - 4: 84.419C

Reader #3: **********
Applicant: Cuyahoga County Office of Early Childhood (S419C170004)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Need for Project

1. The Secretary will consider the needs of the Target Population. In determining the need for the proposed project, the Secretary will consider the magnitude of the need of the Target Population for the services to be provided by a potential PFS project. Applicants should clearly state and demonstrate the extent of the problem facing the Target Population using data and other relevant information.

Strengths:
The applicant clearly articulated the need for its proposed expansion of its Universal Pre-K (UPK) program by indicating the following goals and objectives for its potential PFS project: 1) Determining the provider/community capacity for expansion of the UPK program beyond 4,000 seats; 2) Determining the workforce capacity for expansion in the community; 3) Extending examination of school outcomes for children from UPK up to third grade; 4) Evaluating relationships of children’s social/emotional development and executive functioning and school readiness; 5) Creating a Pay for Success cost/benefit analysis and preliminary economic model based upon the outcomes observed; and 6) Determining the capacity to raise additional capital through a Pay for Success model. Based upon data obtained from the US Census Bureau and the American Community Survey from 2010-2014, there are 33,600 preschool age children between the ages of 3-5 residing in Cuyahoga County Ohio not currently enrolled in kindergarten and would benefit from a high quality state-wide UPK program. The county further predicts that at least 70% of these eligible families would enroll their preschool aged children in its UPK program. The applicant further projected the above need via a well-defined table illustrating the predicted demand of eligible preschool children between the ages of 3-5 residing in the City of Cleveland as well as within the county suburbs of Cleveland. More importantly, the applicant indicates that approximately 59% of preschool aged children between the ages of 3-5 residing in Cleveland City are from families that fall below the federal poverty level of 100%. Unlike it’s urban counterparts, preschoolers in the suburbs of Cleveland City fall below 300% of the federal poverty line, they too are in great need of high quality preschool programming which would ensure that they too would have greater success in kindergarten and beyond. Additionally, the applicant mentions how it plans to double the number of children in its UPK 2.0 program to 4,000 students, it realizes that its expansion efforts will still reach less than 30% of the targeted population-those low income pre-school aged children residing in Cuyahoga County. The applicant further indicated its plans to address the existing gaps between the demand and capacity for its UPK program it wishes to expand throughout Cuyahoga County. Through its existing partnerships with Invest in Children and Starting Point, the applicant vows to provide ongoing training and technical assistance to private care providers to ensure that its publicly funded preschool programs meet the Step Up to Quality (SUTQ) standards as prescribed by the Ohio Department of Education as well as the Ohio Department of Jobs and Family Services.

Weaknesses:
No weaknesses found.

Reader’s Score: 10

Quality of the Preschool Program Design - Quality of the Preschool Program Design

1. The Secretary will consider the quality of the design of the proposed preschool program. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed preschool program, the Secretary will consider the extent to which the intervention strategy is likely to improve student outcomes for the Target Population, based
on quantitative, qualitative, or theoretical evidence, including the extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable and will demonstrate student success. In responding to this criterion, applicants should identify clearly specified and measurable outcomes for the preschool program and explain how these outcomes can be achieved by the program. While these outcomes will inform the selection of Outcome Measures for the PFS project, they do not limit a grantee from evaluating additional Outcome Measures in the course of completing the Preschool PFS Feasibility Study.

Strengths:

Strengths: The applicant provides a comprehensive overview of the components of its UPK program to include its program standards and program components. Further, the applicant provides a thorough overview of its program requirements for implementing and expanding its UPK program by addressing the following areas: Quality, Curriculum, UPK 2.0, Special Needs, Family Engagement, Teacher Qualifications, and At-Risk Children. Relative to assessing outcome measures for the Preschool PFS Feasibility study, the applicant provided extensive data as to how it will be poised to assess the following outcomes: kindergarten readiness, on-time grade matriculation, third-grade reading proficiency, and improved executive functioning.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 25

Preschool PFS Partnership - Preschool PFS Partnership

1. The Secretary will consider the quality of the Preschool PFS Partnership. In evaluating a Preschool PFS Partnership, the Secretary will consider the following:

Reader's Score: 25

Sub Question

1. (c)(1) The quality of an existing Preschool PFS Partnership, including the history of the collaboration, or, if a Preschool PFS Partnership does not exist, the quality of the plan to form a Preschool PFS Partnership.

Strengths:

The applicant provides a detailed depiction as to how it will identify relevant partners to carryout the PFS initiative. The applicant further discussed how dating back to 1999 it created a public/private partnership, Invest in Children with the following intended goals: 1) Creating a high-quality, comprehensive early childhood system of services for children prenatally through age 5; 2) Build community awareness of the importance of healthy early childhood development; and 3) Advocate to change outcomes for disadvantaged children in our community. Since its inception, Invest in Children has yielded $23 million dollars (of which $10 million were public dollars and $13 million consisted of privately matched funds) in the expansion and enhancement efforts of Cuyahoga County's UPK program. This existing partnership with Invest in Children has served over 200,000 students. Additionally, nearly $3 million dollars of federal funding was granted to provide for the following: UPK planning and initial implementation, USDE's Fund for Improvement of Education (FIE), as well as the implementation of the USDE’s Early Learning Opportunities grant. Further, it established a Partnership Council consisting of community, public, and private leaders for the sole purpose of providing oversight of the UPK expansion efforts. Further noted, Invest in Children have existing partnerships with other anchoring community service providers- Starting Point and other relevant partners to include families in the further engagement of its expanded UPK program. Moreover, the Cuyahoga County’s UPK program has been nationally recognized by the National Network of Partnership Schools (NNPS) for
its long-term successes and commitment to meaningful family engagement within a preschool setting and at home for eligible preschool aged children of Cuyahoga County.

Weaknesses:
No weaknesses found.

Reader’s Score: 15

2. (c)(2) The extent to which the roles and responsibilities of members or proposed members of a Preschool PFS Partnership are clearly described and are appropriate and sufficient to successfully implement a PFS project.

Strengths:
The long standing history of the existing partnerships as mentioned in (c1) will serve to fortify as a meaningful basis for the applicant in meeting the intended goals, objectives, and outcomes needed to successfully implement a PFS project. The following are the proposed members that comprise of the Preschool PFS Partnership to include their respective roles: 1) Cuyahoga County Office of Early Childhood (project lead), Third Sector Partners (technical advisor), and Case Western Reserve University’s Center for Urban Poverty and Community Development (program evaluators). Further, the applicant was able to clearly delineate the roles and responsibilities of those entities that will be responsible for successfully implementing this PFS project. Additionally, the applicant will evoke a PFS Advisory Committee consisting of a myriad of relevant stakeholder groups tasked to provide additional support and guidance in ensuring that the goals and objectives outlined in this Preschool PFS Feasibility Study are met.

Weaknesses:
No weaknesses found.

Reader’s Score: 10

Quality of the Work Plan - Quality of the Work Plan

The Secretary will consider the quality of the work plan. In determining the quality of the work plan, the Secretary will consider the following factors:

Reader’s Score: 25

Sub Question

1. (d)(1) The adequacy of the work plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed Feasibility Study project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks on time. Applicants should identify whether a contractor will conduct the Feasibility Study and, if appropriate, the extent to which the timeline for selecting and hiring the contractor is reasonable and sufficient for completing the project on time and within budget.

Strengths:
The applicant provides a comprehensive overview how it intends to carry-out its ‘Work Plan’ as it aims to expand Cuyahoga County’s UPK program beyond 4,000 slots for eligible preschool aged children through the implementation of its “5” project goals: 1) Determining the community capacity for expansion of the UPK program beyond 4,000 slots; 2) Determining the preschool high-quality workforce capacity in the community; 3) Evaluating child development outcomes (cognitive and social/emotional) of children participating in the UPK program; 4) Creating a cost/benefit analysis and preliminary economic model based upon the outcomes observed; and 5)
Sub Question

Determining the capacity to raise additional capital through Pay for Success model. Additionally, the applicant identified the Third Sector Capital Partners, Inc. as the contractor who will conduct the feasibility study and assured that the contractor will be complete the project on time (within 30 months) and within budget as illustrated through its Feasibility Study Work Stream as illustrated in Exhibit 3. Lastly, the applicant indicates that a Feasibility Report, highlighting the viability of PFS and potential next steps and recommendations for implementing the PFS project will be generated as well as disseminated.

Weaknesses:
No weaknesses found.

Reader’s Score:  12

2. (d)(2) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring stakeholder feedback in the operation of the proposed Preschool PFS Feasibility Pilot. If the Feasibility Study includes the reduction in special education placement as a Financial Benefit, the extent to which the work plan includes outreach to and involvement of the representatives from the State and local special education community or individuals with special education expertise, including groups representing families.

Strengths:
The applicant has ensured that stakeholder feedback will be elicited as a result of establishing an Advisory Committee that will meet bi-weekly to ensure project visioning, troubleshooting, and receive status updates from the two established working groups-1) Intervention and Outcomes; and 2) Contracting and Economics. Additionally, the applicant proposed that through its governance structure as illustrated in Exhibit 4 it ensures that all stakeholders (i.e. Advisory Committee, Project Management Team, and Working Groups) will provide on-going and meaningful dialogue relative to the “8” areas of focus as outlined in the feasibility work plan: 1) Kickoff & Governance; 2) Intervention Assessment & Referral Pathways; 3) Legal & Regulatory Assessment; 4) Initial Funder Assessment; 5) Data Assessment & Access; 6) Outcome Metrics & Evaluation Assessment; 7) Cost/Benefit Analysis & Economic Model; and 8) Feasibility Report and Close-Out.

Weaknesses:
No weaknesses found.

Reader’s Score:  10

3. (d)(3) The extent to which the time commitments of the project director and team and other key project personnel are appropriate and adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project.

Strengths:
The applicant has identified all relevant personnel who will be charged with meeting the intended goals of this project as highlighted in Exhibit 6 which features the following: project participants, scope of work, meeting frequency, group lead(s), team, personnel responsible for oversight, as well as the two established working groups. Additionally, the applicant proposed that the day-to-day coordination and execution will be the responsibility of the Project Management Team which comprises staffers from Third Sector, Cuyahoga County Office of Early Childhood, and Case Western Reserve University. Further, the applicant provides a PFS Feasibility Pilot Work Plan Timeline showcasing the planned implementation of the “8” areas of focus chronicled in (d)(2).

Weaknesses:
No weaknesses found.
Quality of the Project Leadership and Team - Quality of the Project Leadership and Team

1. The Secretary will consider the quality of the project leadership and team. The Secretary will consider the extent to which the applicant has the project and financial management experience necessary to manage the Preschool PFS Feasibility Pilot, including:

   1. (e)(1) Managing and overseeing similar projects (e.g., PFS or other project related work, experience with early childhood education) with specific examples of prior accomplishments and outcomes; and

   Strengths:
   Per the submitted cv’s of the project leadership, they all have the relevant background-knowledge, skills, and abilities; in particular program management and evaluation, needed in order to manage the Preschool PFS Feasibility Project. Additionally, the applicant provided supporting evidence of its past histories of managing and overseeing Pay for Success and other similar projects. Further, one of its managing partners serves as an independent evaluator of a county Pay for Success program.

   Weaknesses:
   No weaknesses found.

2. (e)(2) Managing Federal grants, including plans for ensuring compliance with Federal guidelines.

   Strengths:
   The applicant has demonstrated that it has the capacity to manage and comply with federal guidelines as evidenced by its past histories of grant awards to include its partnership with the George Gund Foundation, which was an active partner in launching Cuyahoga’s first county-level Pay for Success project.

   Weaknesses:
   No weaknesses found.

Budget Narrative - Budget Narrative

1. The Secretary will consider the adequacy of resources necessary to complete the Feasibility Study, including any philanthropic or other resources that may be contributed toward the project. In determining the adequacy of resources, the Secretary will consider the extent to which the budget will adequately support program activities and achieve desired outputs and outcomes.

   Strengths:
   The budget presented for this proposal as outlined on pages e7 and e8 appears to be both reasonable and necessary relative to providing the needed and adequate resources in addressing the goals and objectives of this competition. The applicant was able to provide a budget narrative that clearly identified resources needed to implement this project.
Additionally, the applicant noted that although the Urban Institute and the National Head Start Association have pledged their support; at the time of this proposal submission, neither organization could commit to a specified dollar amount.

Weaknesses:
No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 10

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority

1. Competitive Priority: Outcome Measures Across Various Domains
To meet this priority, an applicant must propose a Feasibility Study to evaluate if PFS is viable that would evaluate social and emotional or Executive Functioning Outcome Measures, or both. These potential outcome measures may be predictive of future school success, cost savings, cost avoidance, and other societal benefits, and may appropriate to include in a PFS project. (up to 5 points)

Strengths:
The applicant has met the Competitive Preference Priority for the Competition as it intends to expand its UPK preschool program by examining the causal relationship between executive functioning and kindergarten readiness. The applicant will consider the following measures; however, it will only select one: 1) The Devereux Early Childhood Assessment (DECA); 2) The Head –Toes-Knees-Shoulder; 3) The Behavior Rating Inventory of Executive Functioning-Preschool Version; and 4) The Social Skills Improvement System (SSIS).

Weaknesses:
No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 5

Absolute Priority – Feasibility Study - Absolute Priority – Feasibility Study

1. Under this priority, the applicant must propose a Feasibility Study that will determine the viability of using a PFS approach to expand or improve a preschool program for a Target Population, and describe the potential Outcome Measures the applicant proposes to identify and evaluate for appropriateness for PFS. Any applicant that includes a Feasibility Study for a PFS project that proposes to reduce the need for special education and related services as an Outcome Measure must also include at least one other meaningful and substantive Outcome Measure of short-, medium-, or longterm student achievement, such as kindergarten readiness, reading and math growth or achievement, and improved social and emotional skills.

Yes

Reader's Score: 0

Absolute Priority – Feasibility Study - Absolute Priority – Feasibility Study
1. Under this priority, the applicant must propose a Feasibility Study that will determine the viability of using a PFS approach to expand or improve a preschool program for a Target Population, and describe the potential Outcome Measures the applicant proposes to identify and evaluate for appropriateness for PFS. Any applicant that includes a Feasibility Study for a PFS project that proposes to reduce the need for special education and related services as an Outcome Measure must also include at least one other meaningful and substantive Outcome Measure of short-, medium-, or long-term student achievement, such as kindergarten readiness, reading and math growth or achievement, and improved social and emotional skills.

Strengths:
The applicant met the Absolute Priority for this competition through the proposed use of its UPK program that will further ameliorate long-term student achievement, kindergarten readiness, reading and math growth, and improved social and emotional skills for the extension of its UPK program.

Weaknesses:
The applicant should further explore how it can expand services beyond the reach of the stated 4,000 children as the identified needs of the county resident children are vast.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 10/31/2016 02:57 PM