

Technical Review Cover Sheet

Panel Details

Fiscal Year 2017 **CFDA/Subprogram** 84.215N **Schedule No** 1 **Tier No.** 1

Panel Name

Applicant Name Self Enhancement, Inc. **PR/Award No** U215N170045

Questions

	Points Possible	Points Scored
1. Selection Criteria		
Need	15	14
Project Design	30	30
Project Services	20	20
Management Plan	20	20
Adequacy of Resources	15	15
TOTAL	100	99

Priority Questions

1. Competitive Preference Priority

Priority	3	3
----------	---	---

Priority	3	3
Priority	1	
Priority	1	0
<hr/>		
TOTAL	8	6
<hr/>		
GRAND TOTAL	108	105

Technical Review Form

Applicant Name Self Enhancement, Inc. **PR/Award No** U215N170045

Reviewer Name

Selection Criteria - Need for Project

1.

The magnitude or severity of the problems to be addressed by the proposed project as described by indicators of need and other relevant indicators identified in part by the needs assessment and segmentation analysis.

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

The extent to which specific gaps or weaknesses in services, infrastructure, or opportunities have been identified and will be addressed by the proposed project, including the nature and magnitude of those gaps or weaknesses.

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

Strengths:

1a. The applicant provided clarity about the problem to improve the academic and community health outcomes of more than 7,000 students and their

families in the underserved and under-resourced communities in Portland, Multnomah County, Oregon (p. e15). Applicant proposed a rationale from the Coalition of Communities of Color's findings that communities of color in Multnomah County suffer more than similar communities of color nationally. For example, the income, poverty, occupation and education, communities of color in the target area have between 15% and 20% worse outcomes than people of similar background elsewhere in the US, underscoring the need for comprehensive programs such as the proposed ARPNI (pgs. e23-e25). Another noted strength of the Albina-Rockwood Promise Neighborhood Initiative (ARPNI) is the collaborative network partnership for increasing student performance and family resilience based on the academic needs of children as demonstrated by student achievement data at the selected schools from state standardized tests and family/community support need (pgs. e26-e39).

1b. The applicant provided the comprehensive overview of the geographically area as highly distressed as depicted on census tracts map (p. 10). The applicant proposed services with two non-contiguous communities in Multnomah County, which are both high-need areas that have been dramatically affected by urban renewal: the Albina neighborhood, residing in increasingly isolated pockets of poverty; and the Rockwood neighborhood, with the highest density of poverty of any urban area in the state of Oregon, even as it strains to absorb an influx of refugees and immigrants, along with communities of color displaced by gentrification. Combined, the total area to be served includes approximately 26,000 residents, with over 33% of residents living in poverty, nearly double the percentage of families living in poverty in the county (18%) and in the state (16.5%)(pgs. 10-12). The applicant provides clarity of its rationale for including the non-contiguous area.

1c. The applicant presented size and scope of population affected and the services of the seven collaborating nonprofit organizations in Portland, Oregon leading the Albina-Rockwood Promise Neighborhood Initiative (ARPNI). Together they are crucial partners driving culturally specific and culturally responsive partnerships for educational equity and significant, measurable improvements in achievement and other student outcomes at high-need schools (pg. e28-e40). The applicant identified specific gaps in services in the ARPNI service area to build upon turnaround efforts within Jefferson High School expanding services along cradle to career needs. Applicant uses SEI's Whole School Model (WSM) to address gaps or weaknesses with coordinated in-school, after-school, summer, family engagement, and wraparound support as key component of Jefferson's reorganization as a middle college program offering opportunities to earn fully transferable college credits while in high school. (p. e27-e35).

Weaknesses:

1(a)(b). No weaknesses are noted.

1(c). The applicant failed to provide clarity of whether the applicant would be serving all teen parents or serving only families who have students attending Jefferson High School (e40).

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 14

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

2.

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

2a. The applicant proposed the Self-Enhancement Inc.'s proven logic model that aligns a continuum of supports tailored for high needs schools to encompass the pipeline from early childhood to college and career; and expand the WSM model across-the-pipeline efforts in the even more diverse Rockwood community, an area experiencing dramatic increase in its number of students of color, ELL students, and students living in poverty. The coordinated service continuum addresses academic and family/community support indicators from birth into college/career entry. For example, 1,495 youth benefit from intensive, coordinated youth advocacy and academic skills-building (e.g., Individual Success Plans, mentoring); family engagement (e.g., prenatal care, early learning, home visits, asset-building, leadership); resource navigation (e.g., housing, health, employment); school improvement support; and systemic alignment (e.g., data-sharing, cross-referrals, communications, broad-based advisory board, formative and summative evaluations). The ARPNI build on the success of Self Enhancement, Inc. in dramatically improving the graduation rate from low-income families comprise the majority of the enrollment. SEI's Whole School Model (WSM) of coordinated in-school, after-school, summer, family engagement, and wraparound support is a key component of Jefferson's reorganization as a middle college program offering opportunities to earn fully transferable college credits while in high school (p. e42-e43).

2b. The applicant provided comprehensive data agreement for a rigorous national evaluation method using a robust longitudinal system with objective performance measures for collecting, tracking, sharing, and analyzing individual aggregate outcome data. The applicant provided comprehensive logic model describing proposed quantitative and qualitative data for proposed project (p. e41-e44).

2c. The applicant proposed a strong theory of change of driving equity through integrated evidence-based, culturally specific and responsive continuum of cradle-to-career programs that empower traditionally underserved students and families of color to achieve academic and economic success. This strong theory links cohesively to the logic model and strategic framework for proposed project (p. e40-e41).

Weaknesses:

2(a)(b)(c). No weaknesses are noted.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 30

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Services

3.

The quality and sufficiency of strategies for ensuring equal access and treatment for eligible project participants who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability.

The likelihood that the services to be provided by the proposed project will lead to improvement in the achievement of students as measured against rigorous academic standards.

The quality of the applicant’s plan to establish formal and informal partnerships, including the alignment of the visions, theories of action, and theories of change described in its memorandum of understanding, and to create a system for holding partners accountable for performance in accordance with the memorandum of understanding.

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

Strengths:

3a. The applicant presents the quality of the Relationship Model “2.0” as a redefined strategy of culture based on environmental surroundings to ensure equal access and treatment for students and families regardless of race, ethnicity, gender, or religion. The applicant presented the following strategies: each student assignment consisted of an in-school youth advocate; each student received individual success plan with goals of academic and other identified needs; each students received an advocate to monitor progress; and each student received a family engagement coordinator to support school to home supports that represent a high quality, sufficient strategy for ensuring equal access and treatment for all (e45).

3b. The applicant presented hallmarks of the theory of change using equity of excellence and the culturally responsive services as evidence-and practice-based cradle-to-career continuum for traditionally underserved student and families (e46). The applicant provided the effective programs of partners in Multnomah County as a rigorous service for culturally responsive providers to collaborate more deeply using shared resources and approaches. The applicant presents organizing vision and theory of change as a set of standards that bind together a group of community-based partners with deep and proven services for proposed project e-46-e48). In addition, the applicant reflected standards based on the SEI’s WSM experience and results with youth advocacy/coordination, family advocacy, engagement and resource navigation and wraparound system of care for students and families. It is highly likely that the proposed project will lead to improvement in the achievement of students as measured against rigorous academic standards (e48).

3c. The applicant presented a high quality vision and theory of change that each partner organization provided through WSM principles, strategies, and service of culturally specific/responsive programs to students and families. The applicant proposed specific program designs that will support the overall project with each intervention, including the evidence base, the need segmentation analysis, the number of children/families served, and the cost (Appendix F; 135).

Weaknesses:

3(a)(b)(c). No weaknesses are noted.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

4.

Capacity Quality of the Management Plan 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.

The adequacy of the management plan’s provisions on collecting, analyzing, and using data for decision making, learning, continuous improvement, and accountability, including whether the applicant has a plan to build, adapt, or expand a longitudinal data system that integrates student-level data from multiple sources in order to measure progress while abiding by privacy laws and requirements, and ensuring that any systems built, adapted, or expanded upon includes essential security controls.

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

Strengths:

4a. Applicant provided an adequate management plan with detailed experiences and capacities of diverse and complementary organizations. The applicant presented the detailed scope of work and appropriate communications across groups with an implementation plan with fidelity, an effective flow of decision-making and actions through ARPNI advisory board, SF2020 Leadership group, and ARPNI Operations Team (pg. e95-e97). The applicant presented resumes of experienced staff to manage case management and data systems within budget (e134-e135).

4b. The applicant demonstrated the experience and capacity to create strong partnerships focusing on improving the use of data and deepening the evidence base through a robust data system—integrated with those of our local LEAs—in which services providers and local and national evaluators can record, share, track, and analyze data, with regular reviews to use data to refine services and to undertake longitudinal studies to demonstrate what works. The applicant’s Memoranda of Understanding with the two ARPNI school districts are already in force, with data sharing and analysis currently taking place (e98-e108). The applicant provides integrated HIPPA/FRPA compliant data systems that enables linking individual case management data with academics and other administrative data (p. e97-102).

Weaknesses:

4(a)(b). No weaknesses are noted.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

5.

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

5a. The applicant provided reasonable cost in relation to the number of persons served through the narrative and budget. The applicant presented allocations for office supplies (e.g., copier paper, flashdrives, files, Chartpaks, and other items for project staff) to support years 1-5 planning and development activities and for annual implementation of pipeline activities to include instructional materials (e.g., for parent engagement, student leadership, college/career preparation, and other in-school, after-school (p. e113).

5b. The applicant presented the ARPNI partners as the main contacts of implementing key resources such as an integrated data system to support both active case management and track longitudinal data from multiple sources. The applicant presented an effective data system that uses Efforts to Outcomes (ETO) software for tracking data with individuals receiving services or participating in programs. The applicant presented an effective system for both managing case and tracking longitudinal data from multiple sources (pg. e49-e69). The applicant presented summary of matching resources and letters of commitment with broad-based support from key stakeholders with long-term sustainability of current funders such as Multnomah County, Portland Public Schools and United Way other partners (appendix D; e-197-e198)

5c. The applicant presented letters of commitment from partners addressing funding and programmatic assets with services that are consistent with federal grant requirements. The applicant presented 50% of the requested funding in year one and 25% in year two for the support of planning activities for the development and implementation of ARPNI pipeline services (p. Appendix D; e113-e114).

Weaknesses:

5(a)(b)(c). No weaknesses are noted.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 15

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority

1.

**Competitive Preference Priority 1
0 or 3 Points**

Byrne Criminal Justice Innovation (BCJI) Program

To meet this priority, an applicant must propose to serve geographic areas that were the subject of a targeted strategy addressing crime in a specific community pursuant to a BCJI grant awarded by the U.S. Department of Justice during FY 2012 or later years. To be eligible under this priority, the applicant must either: (1) Be able to demonstrate that it has received a BCJI grant; or (2) provide, in its application, a memorandum of understanding between it and a partner that is a recipient of a BCJI grant. The memorandum of understanding must indicate a commitment on the part of the applicant and partner to coordinate implementation and align resources to the greatest extent practicable.

Strengths:

Applicant proposed a geographical area in Oregon to serve target area in addressing crime. Memorandum of understanding scope of work for plan for implementation and evaluation. The alignment of efforts for gang protection through Byrne Criminal Justice Innovation grant, 2012.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses are noted.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 3

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority

2.

**Competitive Preference Priority 2
0 or 3 Points**

Drug Free Communities (DFC) Support Program

To receive points under this priority, the applicant must either: (1) Demonstrate that it has received a DFC grant to prevent opioid abuse (as one of its areas of focus); or (2) provide, in its application, a memorandum of understanding between it and a partner that is a recipient of a DFC grant to address opioid abuse prevention as one of its areas of focus.

Strengths:

The applicant provided a comprehensive memorandum of understanding between it and its partners to address prevention measures in target area.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses are noted.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 3

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority

3.

FOR EVIDENCE BASED REVIEWERS ONLY

**Competitive Preference Priority 3
0 or 1 Points**

Evidence-Based Activities, Strategies, or Interventions

To meet this priority, an applicant must propose to carry out evidence based activities, strategies, or interventions that, based on information included in their application, are supported by promising evidence.

Question Status:Not Completed

Reviewer Score:

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority

4.

**Competitive Preference Priority 4
0 or 1 Points**

Promise Zones

This priority is for projects that are designed to serve and coordinate with a federally designated Promise Zone. To meet this priority, an applicant must include a Certification of Consistency with Promise Zone Goals and Implementation (HUD Form 50153) signed by an authorized representative of the lead organization of a Promise Zone designated by the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) or the United States Department of Agriculture. An application for Promise Neighborhoods grant funds that is not accompanied by a signed certification (HUD Form 50153) will receive zero points for this priority. The certification form is available at [//portal.hud.gov/hudportal/documents/huddoc?id=HUD_Form_50153.pdf](http://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/documents/huddoc?id=HUD_Form_50153.pdf). To view the list of designated Promise Zones and lead organizations please go to www.hud.gov/promisezones.

The applicant did not address this priority.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 0

[< Previous](#)

Technical Review Cover Sheet

Panel Details

Fiscal Year 2017 **CFDA/Subprogram** 84.215N **Schedule No** 1 **Tier No.** 1

Panel Name

Applicant Name Self Enhancement, Inc. **PR/Award No** U215N170045

Questions

	Points Possible	Points Scored
1. Selection Criteria		
Need	15	14
Project Design	30	30
Project Services	20	20
Management Plan	20	20
Adequacy of Resources	15	15
TOTAL	100	99

Priority Questions

1. Competitive Preference Priority

Priority	3	3
Priority	3	3
Priority	1	0
Priority	1	0
<hr/>		
TOTAL	8	6
<hr/>		
GRAND TOTAL	108	105

Technical Review Form

Applicant Name Self Enhancement, Inc. **PR/Award No** U215N170045

Reviewer Name

Selection Criteria - Need for Project

1.

The magnitude or severity of the problems to be addressed by the proposed project as described by indicators of need and other relevant indicators identified in part by the needs assessment and segmentation analysis.

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

The extent to which specific gaps or weaknesses in services, infrastructure, or opportunities have been identified and will be addressed by the proposed project, including the nature and magnitude of those gaps or weaknesses.

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

Strengths:

The applicant provides adequate data to describe the magnitude and severity of problems to be addressed by the proposed project. The applicant provides indicators of needs pulled from various data sources which clearly demonstrate the magnitude and severity of problems. Data sources include Oregon Department of Education, U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, school improvement plans, community input, and county-wide surveys and assessments (pg. e16-23 and e37). Problems cited include: increase in the number of ELL students and students of color, student living in poverty, chronic absenteeism, gaps in educational attainment, and inability of residents to find living wage jobs, 41-42% of residents live in poverty, 14-17.5% unemployment rate, schools are identified as focus or priority schools meaning that they are ranked in the bottom 5-15%, and 45% of residents participate in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (pg. e16-23 and e26-33). In addition, the applicant states that “communities of color have far worse outcomes than people of similar background elsewhere in the U.S. (page e22). The applicant provides detailed charts to present the low number of students who are at or above grade level in reading and math for both elementary and high school students which reflects a need for the proposed program (pg. e33-35). With regards to health, the applicant records higher incidences of chronic illnesses within the target area compared to other parts of the city. For example, diabetes rates 34% higher, asthma rates 17.6-20% higher, and low-birth weight 24% higher (pg. e29 and e32).

Weaknesses :

No weakness noted.

Strengths:

The applicant provides a clear description of the geographic area where services will be provided. For example, the applicant states its intent to provides services in Multnomah County, located in northwest Oregon in the communities of Albina and Rockwood (pg. e22 and 24). The applicant states that Albina has a population of 11,197 and Rockwood has a population of 15,995 (pg. e24). Further, the applicant presents details of serving the non-contiguous communities of Albina and Rockwood due to their high-needs (pg. e24). Lastly, the applicant provides a map of the proposed neighborhoods in the narrative (pg. e24).

Weaknesses:

No weakness noted.

Strengths:

The applicant provides an adequate discussion of its plan to improve services by implementing the proposed project that address specific gaps or weaknesses in services, infrastructure, or opportunities that will be addressed by the proposed project. The applicant presents a chart with indicators, current data, and goals for each indicator for the duration of the proposed project (pg. e38-39). The specific gaps and weaknesses cited include but are not limited to the following: kindergartners demonstrate age appropriate functioning, gaps in academic proficiency in math and ELA, chronic absenteeism, gaps in services that help students be healthy, post-secondary enrollment and completion, and access to internet (pg. e38-39). These gaps and weaknesses in services, infrastructure, and opportunities are clearly identified with specific solutions which are viable options based on community needs. For example, it is the applicant’s intent to provide EHS services, as well as coordinated youth advocacy, family engagement, and wrap-around services.

Weaknesses:

It is unclear if the applicant intends to provide EHS services to all teen parents or just to children whose mothers and fathers attend Jefferson High School which does not address the needs for other children residing in the identified communities (pg. e40).

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 14

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

2.

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

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

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

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

Strength:

The applicant provides detailed and comprehensive information to describe its plan to create a complete pipeline of services, including early learning through grade 12, college- and career-readiness, and family and community supports. The applicant plans to partner with the United Way of the Columbia-Willamette, Albina Head Start, Immigrant and Refugee Community Organization, Latino Network, Metropolitan Family Services, and Native American Youth and Family Center, as well as Portland Public Schools and Reynolds School District to implement the proposed project (pg. e15 and e33). The applicant plans to utilize the Whole School Model which it has thoroughly researched and experience implementing the model with schools in the past (pg. e42). The applicant presents the intended Logic Model within the narrative that provides details of the theory of change, vision, and standards for the proposed project (pg. e43). Additionally, the Logic Model includes resources/inputs, activities, outputs at a scale, and short and long-term outcomes (pg. e43).

Further, the applicant provides details of the Strategic Framework to be implemented with the proposed project which includes the following component relationship model, culture of success, continuum of services, and comprehensiveness. The applicant includes details such as assigning each student an In-School Youth Advocate, utilization of an Individual Success Plan, employing Family Engagement Coordinators and Post High School Coordinators (pg. e45-46). Lastly, the applicant indicates that Whole School Model programs include the following components in-school, after-school, summer, post-high school, parent/family engagement, and wrap-around support services for students and families which further demonstrates its ability to prepare all children in the neighborhood to attain an excellent education and successfully transition to college and a career (pg. e45-46). The applicants plan and network of program partners indicates that the applicant has thoroughly researched ways to significantly increase the proportion of students in the neighborhood that are served by the complete continuum to reach scale over time (pg. e41-46).

Weakness:

No weakness noted.

Strength:

The applicant presents a comprehensive and well-developed plan for the collection, management, and analysis of data. The applicant provides details that it will work with Education Northwest and a national evaluator to implement a robust evaluation process to support the proposed program (pg. e72). The plan includes utilization of a data management team to manage data and the evaluation strategic framework as well as provide oversight for data and evaluation of the proposed program (pg. e96). Additionally, the applicant states their intent to utilize the Effort-to-Outcomes database software to track program data and outcomes (pg. e96).

The applicant appears to have a working platform that will produce quantitative and qualitative data. For example, the applicant states that data will be entered on a weekly basis, quarterly and annual reviews will be conducted, and feedback from community engagement sessions will be used to drive program improvements (pg. e101). The applicant provides a Data Sharing Protocol diagram in the narrative to document the data workflow for the proposed project (pg. e97-99).

Weakness:

No weakness noted.

Strength:

The narrative in this section indicates that the applicant has thoroughly explored all components of the proposed Promise Neighborhoods project and offered a well-justified rationale and strong theory for how it will be implemented. In addition, the applicant provides detailed information on research-informed approaches and programs to be implemented (pg. e66-84). Additionally, the applicant provides an implementation stages table in the Appendix (pg. e141-194). Further, the applicant includes a logic model in the narrative, as well as in the Appendix that provides details of resource inputs, activities, outputs at a scale, and short and long-term results which demonstrates that the applicant has thoroughly explored all components of the proposed Promise Neighborhoods project and offered a well-justified rationale for how it will be implemented (pg. e43 and Appendix: pg. e197).

Weakness:

No weakness noted.

Reviewer Score: 30

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Services

3.

The quality and sufficiency of strategies for ensuring equal access and treatment for eligible project participants who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability.

The likelihood that the services to be provided by the proposed project will lead to improvement in the achievement of students as measured against rigorous academic standards.

The quality of the applicant's plan to establish formal and informal partnerships, including the alignment of the visions, theories of action, and theories of change described in its memorandum of understanding, and to create a system for holding partners accountable for performance in accordance with the memorandum of understanding.

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

Strength:

The applicant provides sufficient information to show how the proposed project will ensure equal access and treatment for eligible project participants. For example, the applicant states that the proposed program is culturally specific and responsive and attuned to the specific needs of the communities to be served (pg. e47). In addition, it is the applicant's intent to collaborate with partners who can match students and families with the appropriate resources and services (pg. e47). Additionally, the applicant provides a comprehensive and detailed evidence table of strategies to be used some of which include: youth advocacy and coordination, family advocacy and engagement, resource navigation, wraparound system of care for students and families, and family economic stability (pg. e47-49). Further, the applicant will employ experienced staff who are well-trained in delivering services in a culturally responsive way (pg. e47).

Weakness:

No weakness noted.

Strength:

The applicant states that implementation of the Whole School Model principles, strategies, and service components will lead to improvement in student achievement as measured against rigorous standards (pg. e49). The applicant provides narrative depicting how the proposed projects Whole School Model implementation will lead to success. The applicant presents a high-quality intervention plan for each service component (i.e., early learning, k-12 education, college and career ready, and family and community support) that clearly identifies each key learning intervention, partners, indicators, and evidence base for the proposed project (pg. e49-71). Interventions include: Early Head Start for teen parents, Ready, Set, Go, AARP Experience Corps, STEM Partnerships and Stewardships, Escalera: Steps to Success, and SEI Parent Involvement Services (pg. e49-71). Additionally, the applicant includes a detailed implementation table in the Appendix

with details of evidence, partners, number of children served, percent of age within cohort, neighborhood served, service of funds, implementation, staging and roll-out (Appendix: pg. e142-194). These components comprise a plan that will comprehensively lead to a high likelihood of success.

Weakness:

No weakness noted.

Strength:

The applicant presents a convincing plan of collaborative partnerships to maximize the effectiveness as well as hold partners accountable for performance of the proposed project. The applicant convincingly demonstrates its ability to establish formal and informal partnerships. For example, the applicant states that the proposed project was developed with input and support from various stakeholder like schools, community-based organizations, government agencies, and families in the proposed neighborhoods (pg. e71). Other methods of community engagement discussed include: PTA meetings, family conferences, conducting school climate surveys, and community-based research surveys (pg. e71). Additionally, the applicant states its intent to use its existing Advisory Board, SF2020 Leadership Group, Operations Team, Program Team, School Leadership Team, and the Data Team who will meet twice monthly to advise on funding opportunities, strategic operational planning, partner performance, and progress towards indicators (pg. e88-94). The applicant provides detailed narrative of each proposed community partner organizations roles and background (pg. e49-71).

Further, the applicant presents a copy of the proposed MOU to be signed by each partner in the Appendix as supporting evidence that provides details of each organizations alignment to the proposed project (like the vision, theories of change and action, governance and decision-making, details of each board, partner commitments, and programmatic commitments (Appendix: pg. e142-194). The applicant provides details of partner participation on the implementation table in the Appendix (Appendix: pg. e142-194). Lastly, the applicant has accountability plans in place with partner organizations. For example, the applicant states that it will provide management and expertise of Promise Neighborhood efforts, facilitate leadership and operation meetings, monitor data sharing agreements and processes, and manage ongoing internal and public communications (pg. e94-96). These components comprise a plan that demonstrates that the applicant can hold each partner accountable to their respective commitments for the proposed project.

Weakness:

No weakness noted.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

4.

Capacity Quality of the Management Plan 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.

The adequacy of the management plan’s provisions on collecting, analyzing, and using data for decision making, learning, continuous improvement, and accountability, including whether the applicant has a plan to build, adapt, or expand a longitudinal data system that integrates student-level data from multiple sources in order to measure progress while abiding by privacy laws and requirements, and ensuring that any systems built, adapted, or expanded upon includes essential security controls.

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

Strengths:

The applicant states that Self-Enhancement Incorporated will be responsible for oversight of the proposed project. Additionally, the applicant includes details of its previous experience (i.e., 36 years) success in managing other large programs and providing families with a continuum of comprehensive services (i.e., school-based advocacy and mentoring, post-secondary and career success, workforce readiness and employment, etc. (pg. 15-16). The applicant presents details of the intended organizational and staffing structure to be used for meeting goals and objectives of the proposed project to demonstrate that it will be on time and within budget.

The applicant presents an implementation plan in the Appendix for each year of the proposed project (Appendix: pg. e142-194) to show that it has milestones for accomplishing all project tasks. For example, the implementation overview provides details of the number of children served and percent of age cohort within each year of the proposed grant and the implementation details include the locations of program services and as well as implementation staging and roll out.

Weakness:

No weakness noted.

Strengths:

The applicant proposes a well-developed plan for collecting, analyzing, and using data. The applicant states its intent to implement an integrated HIPPA/FRPA compliant data system to link all data collected throughout the proposed project. Additionally, the applicant specifies that it will use the Efforts-to-Outcomes software to enter, manage, track, and report data (pg. e97-98). Further, the applicant states that for longitudinal data that it will integrate and track various types of data to measure and track individual progress for children and families (pg. e97). The applicant states that the Data Team will manage the proposed integrated data system (pg. e97).

The applicant provides details that measures will be tracked quarterly and annually, and outcome monitoring will be used to make continuous improvements to all proposed project activities (pg. e98-101). Additionally, the applicant includes a Data Sharing Protocol diagram in the narrative to show the proposed workflow data protocol (pg. e99-100). The applicant states its intent to use Qualtrics (i.e., survey software) to collect data on services offered and analyze outcomes (pg. 99). Lastly, the applicant states that it will utilize Data Sharing Agreements with all partners to ensure all privacy laws and requirements are met (pg. e98-99). The applicant provides a detailed MOU in the Appendix which includes details of the data sharing agreement (Appendix: pg. e132-135).

Weakness:
No weakness noted.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

5.

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

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

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

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

Strength:

The applicant provides details of leveraging and layering resources through partnerships to ensure that families are efficiently served and services are not duplicated (pg. e106-108). In addition, the applicant proposes to serve 1,495 students each year with the requested Promise Neighborhood funds (pg. e110). In addition, the applicant presents details of the overall cost per participant is projected to be under \$3,750 which are reasonable costs in relation to the number of persons to be served and will allow for high-quality services that will lead to the anticipated results of the proposed project (pg. e110)). The applicant provides a detailed budget justification of cost allocations budgeted toward this effort; specific examples include personnel, fringe benefits, domestic travel, supplies, contractual and consultants, and indirect costs (Appendix: pg. e260-264).

Weakness:
No weakness noted.

Strength:

The applicant provides details of a plan for sustainability by describing how it will use public and private funding streams to maximize community impact as well as existing neighborhood assets and programs like municipal agencies, housing authorities, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services and others (pg. e106-108). In addition, the applicant presents details of acquiring additional support from Multnomah County (i.e., 2 million annually) to support the proposed project (pg. e111-112). The applicant provides a document entitled Partners' Financial and Programmatic Commitment with details of each partners matching funds as supporting evidence (Appendix: pg. e136-139).

Weakness:

No weakness noted.

Strength:

The applicant provides a description of the existing neighborhood assets and programs that it intends to use to implement pipeline services (pg. e49-71 and e81-82). The applicant provides detailed tables for each solution (early learning, pre-k-12, college and career, and family and community) (pg. e49-71). The tables provide details of interventions, partners, indicators, and evidence base. Additionally, the applicant identifies initiatives that will support the proposed project some of which include: NAYA's CHXI San Playgroup & Positive Indian Parenting, Kindergarten Readiness, Pre-School Promise, AARA Experience Corp, Escalera, SEI Post-Secondary Program (pg. e49-71). The applicant provides a detailed description of each identified asset and program in the narrative (pg. e49-71). The detailed narrative clearly identifies existing neighborhood assets and programs supported by Federal, State, local, and private funds that will be used to implement pipeline services (pg. e49-71). Lastly, the applicant included a detailed table in the Appendix as supporting evidence (pg. e142-194).

Weakness:

No weakness noted.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 15

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority

1.

Competitive Preference Priority 1

0 or 3 Points

Byrne Criminal Justice Innovation (BCJI) Program

To meet this priority, an applicant must propose to serve geographic areas that were the subject of a targeted strategy addressing crime in a specific

community pursuant to a BCJI grant awarded by the U.S. Department of Justice during FY 2012 or later years. To be eligible under this priority, the applicant must either: (1) Be able to demonstrate that it has received a BCJI grant; or (2) provide, in its application, a memorandum of understanding between it and a partner that is a recipient of a BCJI grant. The memorandum of understanding must indicate a commitment on the part of the applicant and partner to coordinate implementation and align resources to the greatest extent practicable.

The applicant states that its research partner Multnomah County Local Public Safety Coordinating Council received a Byrne Criminal Justice Innovation grant in 2012 (pg. 72-74). In addition, the applicant provides a copy of the memorandum of understanding between it (Albina Rockwood Promise Neighborhood) and Multnomah County District Attorney's Office with details of the commitment to coordinate implementation and align resources in the Appendix as supporting documentation (Appendix: pg. e132-135).

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 3

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority

2.

**Competitive Preference Priority 2
0 or 3 Points**

Drug Free Communities (DFC) Support Program

To receive points under this priority, the applicant must either: (1) Demonstrate that it has received a DFC grant to prevent opioid abuse (as one of its areas of focus); or (2) provide, in its application, a memorandum of understanding between it and a partner that is a recipient of a DFC grant to address opioid abuse prevention as one of its areas of focus.

It is the applicant's intent to partner with Multnomah County Health Department (MCHD) who is a recipient of a 2014-2019 Drug Free Communities grant from SAMHSA and participates in the Tri-County Opioid Safety Coalition to prevent and respond to substance abuse and address the opioid crisis (pg. e74-77). Further, the

applicant supports this partnership by including a copy of the memorandum of understanding between it and MCHD in the Appendix (pg. e132-135).

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 3

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority

3.

FOR EVIDENCE BASED REVIEWERS ONLY

**Competitive Preference Priority 3
0 or 1 Points**

Evidence-Based Activities, Strategies, or Interventions

To meet this priority, an applicant must propose to carry out evidence based activities, strategies, or interventions that, based on information included in their application, are supported by promising evidence.

This CPP will be addressed by and Evidence Reviewer.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority

4.

**Competitive Preference Priority 4
0 or 1 Points**

Promise Zones

This priority is for projects that are designed to serve and coordinate with a federally designated Promise Zone. To meet this priority, an applicant must include a Certification of Consistency with Promise Zone Goals and Implementation (HUD Form 50153) signed by an authorized representative of the lead organization of a Promise Zone designated by the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) or the United States Department of Agriculture. An application for Promise Neighborhoods grant funds that is not accompanied by a signed certification (HUD Form 50153) will receive zero points for this priority. The certification form is available at [//portal.hud.gov/hudportal/documents/huddoc?id=HUD_Form_50153.pdf](http://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/documents/huddoc?id=HUD_Form_50153.pdf). To view the list of designated Promise Zones and lead organizations please go to www.hud.gov/promisezones.

The applicant did not address CPP 4.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 0

[< Previous](#)

Technical Review Cover Sheet

Panel Details

Fiscal Year 2017 **CFDA/Subprogram** 84.215N **Schedule No** 1 **Tier No.** 1

Panel Name

Applicant Name Self Enhancement, Inc. **PR/Award No** U215N170045

Questions

	Points Possible	Points Scored
1. Selection Criteria		
Need	15	14
Project Design	30	30
Project Services	20	20
Management Plan	20	20
Adequacy of Resources	15	15
TOTAL	100	99

Priority Questions

1. Competitive Preference Priority

Priority	3	3
Priority	3	3
Priority	1	
Priority	1	0
<hr/>		
TOTAL	8	6
<hr/>		
GRAND TOTAL	108	105

Technical Review Form

Applicant Name Self Enhancement, Inc. **PR/Award No** U215N170045

Reviewer Name

Selection Criteria - Need for Project

1.

The magnitude or severity of the problems to be addressed by the proposed project as described by indicators of need and other relevant indicators identified in part by the needs assessment and segmentation analysis.

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

The extent to which specific gaps or weaknesses in services, infrastructure, or opportunities have been identified and will be addressed by the proposed project, including the nature and magnitude of those gaps or weaknesses.

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

Strengths: The applicant is clear in presenting the magnitude of the problems faced in the geographical area of Multnomah and the neighborhood area. The applicant made a case for the shifting of need to the Rockwood community that now has high minority percentages and a high poverty rate. (e18) Twenty-nine percent of Multnomah County population is minority. (e22-23) The applicant cited the 2010 Coalition of Communities of Color and Portland State University's research profile report of minorities in Multnomah County. The report documented that communities of color in the County have 15% and 20% worse outcomes (education, financial, housing, health, etc.) than people of similar background elsewhere in the United States. (e23)

Weaknesses: No weakness found.

Strengths: The applicant did an extensive job of defining the geographical area of Multnomah County and the neighborhood area. The proposed project will be serving 7,000 students and families in the Portland area. Partners include United Way and five community-based organizations serving Head Start, immigrants and refugees, Latino network, metro families, and Native Americans. Geographical areas of Albina and Rockwood are well described as areas of need in the Portland area. (e20) The applicant plans to expand current services in the Albina neighborhood and establish access to services in the Rockwood community. (e20) Areas are non-contiguous with a rationale for choosing that population. (e24) The poverty rate in Albina and Rockwood communities is nearly double that of families living in poverty in the county (18%) and in the state of Oregon (16.5%)

The applicant has documented the high minority status in both Albina (37%) and Rockwood (54%) with great detail. The high poverty status of minority populations has also been documented: Albina (42% for Blacks and 34% for Latinos) and Rockwood (79% Native Americans, 66% Blacks, 54% Latinos and 41% Pacific Islanders). (e27; e30) A median income comparison in Albina of \$50,000 for non-minority and \$17,600 for minority is provided. (e27) Rockwood has a median household income of \$28,726. (e31) Unemployment rate for Blacks is high (17.5% for Albina, 14% in Rockwood). Albina graduation rate is 11-12 times higher for Whites than Blacks and less than 5% of Blacks are at grade level. In Rockwood 30% have less than a high school diploma. (e31) Also documented were high low-birth weights and higher asthma rates. (e29) The crime rate is 6.8% for Albina Blacks with high juvenile crime, opioid abuse and gang violence reported. (e29) Rockwood residents lack adequate transportation options; yet must travel an average of 6.3 miles for affordable food. Rockwood also documents high diabetes, asthma and coronary heart disease rates. Crime increased 62% between 2011 and 2013 in Rockwood. (e32) Both communities record a majority of minority students who perform at or below grade level. (e34)

Weaknesses: No weakness found.

Strengths: The applicant has extensively identified the gaps and/or weaknesses in services, infrastructure, and the opportunities that exist in the target area. The applicant will utilize the Whole School Model (WSM) to address identified gaps. WSM has been successful in historically black urban high schools. WSM will be used to integrate support services, increase number of adults working within schools, and increase family engagement and advocacy. A previously developed data system that integrates local LEAs with providers will be utilized. (e16) SEI has existed for 36 years. It successfully turned around Jefferson High School. (e17) Multnomah County Commission committed \$2 million to the project because of its successes. (e21)

Appropriate and specific data has been compiled on GPRA indicators at multiple levels for four years. (e38-40) Through data analysis, gaps have been recognized for high need populations in early learning, generational poverty and low education levels, and exclusionary discipline in the schools. (e40-41) Therefore, the applicant proposes Early Head Start services and reducing exclusionary discipline numbers. (e40) Additionally the applicant will be utilizing the Whole School Model (WSM) in all partner schools to help assure cradle to career services are available. (Logic Model; e42-43) Components include outcomes such as children

enter school ready to learn, children are proficient in core academics, transitions are focused upon, and graduation rates are increased with post-secondary opportunities made available.

Weaknesses: It is unclear whether the applicant is providing Early Head Start services to all 3 and 4 year olds in the neighborhood. It appears that Early Head Start will be made available only to the parents of Jefferson High School students. (e40)

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 14

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

2.

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

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

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

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

Strengths: The applicant has provided a clear explanation of services that create a complete birth to career pipeline of services. The applicant will utilize a proven successful WSM model that includes relationship building, a culture of success, a continuum of services and a comprehensive plan for improvement from birth to career. (e44) Positive activities outlined are In-School Youth Advocates, use of individual success plans, family engagement coordinators, and school programs that run from in-school, to after-school, to summer and post-secondary programs. (e45-46) Additional strengths are parent/family engagement initiatives and wraparound support services for students and families. (e46) Transition points are recognized and supported. A number of Promise Neighborhood initiatives are developed to ensure early learning interventions are available and timely. (e49) The applicant has provided extensive evidence that a birth through career pipeline will be established, primarily through the use of the Whole School Model. The model was successful at Jefferson High School and now will be scaled to other schools in the project neighborhood. (e20)

Weaknesses: No weakness found.

Strengths: The applicant has provided measurable objectives that clearly relate to the intended outcomes of the project. A detailed logic model with inputs, activities, outputs, and short- and long-term outcomes is provided. (e43) Services such as Early Head Start, the Whole School Model (WSM), and attention to transitions, attendance, and post-secondary opportunities strengthen the proposal. Quantitative and qualitative data will be collected and utilized from a system-wide data base.

Weaknesses: No weakness found.

Strengths: The proposed project is supported by strong theory, the Whole School Model. The applicant supported the use of the Whole School Model with core findings from a two-year quasi-experimental model. Those findings include: improved graduation rates, increased levels of academic success; determination to complete school; and meeting of high school benchmarks. (e59) The AARP Experience Corps, culturally specific youth and advocacy programs, and post-secondary program successes are among the many the applicant has provided a sound basis for utilizing in this project. (e60-69) Additional interventions are detailed in Appendix F.

Weaknesses: No weakness found.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 30

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Services

3.

The quality and sufficiency of strategies for ensuring equal access and treatment for eligible project participants who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability.

The likelihood that the services to be provided by the proposed project will lead to improvement in the achievement of students as measured against rigorous academic standards.

The quality of the applicant's plan to establish formal and informal partnerships, including the alignment of the visions, theories of action, and theories of change described in its memorandum of understanding, and to create a system for holding partners accountable for performance in accordance with the memorandum of understanding.

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

Strengths: There is a broad-based contingency of programs and services that will be sufficient to assure equal access and treatment of underrepresented groups of eligible project participants. The applicant has also presented GPRA data for the past four years and has provisions established to continue gathering such data. (e38-40) Three of the schools hold regular interdisciplinary team meetings between partners and school staff to ensure a continuum of wrap-around services that meet the needs of all participants, including underrepresented populations. (e70) There is a shared data system for all partners that includes services and information up through the state level. This No Wrong Door approach helps to ensure no child or family falls through the cracks. (e70)

Weaknesses: No weakness found.

Strengths: It is likely that the project will lead to improvement of the academic levels of the students relative to rigorous academic standards. The project was developed with input and support from school leaders, community-based organizations, government agencies, businesses and parents and families in targeted neighborhoods. (e71) Services will be enhanced at all levels from birth to post-secondary education. The Jefferson High School model serves as a successful endeavor that provides a strong base for the efforts within this project. Support is evident for the project and included for all partners in the MOU.

Weaknesses: No weakness found.

Strengths: ARPNI has many partners in place that are currently working with the Albina neighborhood. These partners have signed the MOU to showcase agreement with the vision, and theories of change and action. (e132-135) These same entities will work with the Rockwood neighborhood in the new proposal. Two of the entities include Home Forward and the schools of both neighborhoods. Home Forward will work with families to assure appropriate housing for families. The schools have in place numerous programs to support minority populations and make appropriate referrals to existing programs to support the residents. (e81-94) A Leadership Group and the ARPNI Advisory Board are in place as the governance bodies to ensure that the work plan has fidelity; flow of decision-making; and appropriate communication across all groups. (e95) Additional team efforts include the ARPNI program team, school leadership teams; and the SF2020 data team. (e95-96)

Weaknesses: No weakness found.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

4.

Capacity Quality of the Management Plan 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.

The adequacy of the management plan's provisions on collecting, analyzing, and using data for decision making, learning, continuous improvement, and accountability, including whether the applicant has a plan to build, adapt, or expand a longitudinal data system that integrates student-level data from multiple sources in order to measure progress while abiding by privacy laws and requirements, and ensuring that any systems built, adapted, or expanded upon includes essential security controls.

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

Strengths: The applicant has provided information to adequately support the achievement of objectives on time and within budget. Clearly defined responsibilities are provided. Also included are milestones and project tasks. (Appendix F and implementation document) Each partner has an existing relationship with other entities in the neighborhoods. (e96) The likelihood that the objectives of the proposed project will be met and within budget is high.

Weaknesses: No weakness found.

Strengths: The applicant is using an integrated HIPPA/FRPA data system that enables linking individual case management data with academic and other administrative data. (e97) There is integrity and privacy built in to the system as entities will only be able to access the data for individuals and families within their programs. (e97) Specific data fields will allow for comparisons of data. ARPNI has data sharing agreements with Portland and Reynolds public schools as well as the Multnomah Education Service District. (e98) A data sharing plan was provided. (e99) The applicant will provide summary data to entities on a need-to-know basis. (e100) An advisory board is in place that includes community members, public officials, program partners and leaders. All nine members have equal representation. Monthly meetings will provide the time needed to assure high-quality program design and implementation. (e103) There is a commitment presented to work with all partners and the national evaluator (e110 and MOU 132-135) The applicant has provided an adequate management plan with provisions for collecting, analyzing, and using data at many levels to measure progress and inform practice and stakeholders.

Weaknesses: No weakness found.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

5.

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

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

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

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

Strengths: There is an estimated per student cost of \$2,083 with a total of 7,010 students served each year. (e110-111) This cost appears reasonable given the extensive services provided. The budget and narrative indicate reasonable expenditures for program execution. (e260-264)

Weaknesses: No weakness found.

Strengths: The applicant has demonstrated that it has the resources and support from partners to operate the project beyond the length of the grant. The applicant has documentation of matching funds in the MOU and budget. Continued community support to sustain the program beyond the funding period was indicated. (e114; e132-135)

Weaknesses: No weakness found.

Strengths: The applicant has identified existing neighborhood assets and programs supported by alternative funding. In addition to grant funds, other funds totaling \$9,028,689 in year one have been provided by the existing SF2020 Partnership, United Way, Reynolds and Portland School Districts, Multnomah County, an USDOE Promise Neighborhood grant, and other public and private donors. (e112-113)

Weaknesses: No weakness found.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 15

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority

1.

**Competitive Preference Priority 1
0 or 3 Points**

Byrne Criminal Justice Innovation (BCJI) Program

To meet this priority, an applicant must propose to serve geographic areas that were the subject of a targeted strategy addressing crime in a specific community pursuant to a BCJI grant awarded by the U.S. Department of Justice during FY 2012 or later years. To be eligible under this priority, the applicant must either: (1) Be able to demonstrate that it has received a BCJI grant; or (2) provide, in its application, a memorandum of understanding between it and a partner that is a recipient of a BCJI grant. The memorandum of understanding must indicate a commitment on the part of the applicant and partner to coordinate implementation and align resources to the greatest extent practicable.

Strengths: Multnomah County District Attorney's Office and the Multnomah County Local Public Safety Coordinating Council received a Byrne Criminal Justice Innovation grant in FY2012 to address gang activity and related crimes. (e72) The applicant provided a listing of crime reduction strategies and neighborhood revitalization strategies developed as a result of the funding. (e73) A MOU between the Multnomah County District Attorney's Office and the ARPNI is found in Appendix C. A detailed MOU exists between SEI and its partners. Included in the MOU are financial commitments, alignment to the model of the partnership, and commitments to data-sharing and accountability. (Appendix E, e130-139)

Weaknesses: No weakness found.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 3

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority

2.

**Competitive Preference Priority 2
0 or 3 Points**

Drug Free Communities (DFC) Support Program

To receive points under this priority, the applicant must either: (1) Demonstrate that it has received a DFC grant to prevent opioid abuse (as one of its areas of focus); or (2) provide, in its application, a memorandum of understanding between it and a partner that is a recipient of a DFC grant to address opioid abuse prevention as one of its areas of focus.

Strengths: The applicant has documented that a wide-spread opioid epidemic does exist in Oregon and in Multnomah County. (e74-75) The Mental Health and Addictions Services Division of the Multnomah County Health Department (MHASD) has received a 2014-19 Drug Free Communities grant from SAMHSA. (e76) MHASD is also a recipient of a 2014-18 SAMHSA grant supporting the Multnomah Behavioral Health Treatment Court. (e76) A MOU between Multnomah County Health Department and ARPNI is found in Appendix C.

Weaknesses: No weakness found.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 3

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority

3.

FOR EVIDENCE BASED REVIEWERS ONLY

**Competitive Preference Priority 3
0 or 1 Points**

Evidence-Based Activities, Strategies, or Interventions

To meet this priority, an applicant must propose to carry out evidence based activities, strategies, or interventions that, based on information included in their

application, are supported by promising evidence.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score:

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority

4.

**Competitive Preference Priority 4
0 or 1 Points**

Promise Zones

This priority is for projects that are designed to serve and coordinate with a federally designated Promise Zone. To meet this priority, an applicant must include a Certification of Consistency with Promise Zone Goals and Implementation (HUD Form 50153) signed by an authorized representative of the lead organization of a Promise Zone designated by the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) or the United States Department of Agriculture. An application for Promise Neighborhoods grant funds that is not accompanied by a signed certification (HUD Form 50153) will receive zero points for this priority. The certification form is available at [//portal.hud.gov/hudportal/documents/huddoc?id=HUD_Form_50153.pdf](http://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/documents/huddoc?id=HUD_Form_50153.pdf). To view the list of designated Promise Zones and lead organizations please go to www.hud.gov/promisezones.

Strengths:

Weaknesses: Priority 4 was not addressed.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 0

[< Previous](#)

