

Technical Review Cover Sheet

Panel Details

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

Panel Name Panel - 40

Applicant Name University of Maryland, Baltimore **PR/Award No** U215N170040

Questions

	Points Possible	Points Scored
1. Selection Criteria		
Need	15	15
Project Design	30	30
Project Services	20	19
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
TOTAL	8	6
GRAND TOTAL	108	105

Technical Review Form

Applicant Name University of Maryland, Baltimore **PR/Award No** U215N170040

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

(1) The applicant fully addresses the criteria and provides evidence of the severity of the problem. For example, approximately 1,998 families, 723 of which include children under the age of 18. The targeted area is made up of 10,071 residents—32% of whom are children (US Census Bureau, 2016). There is much disadvantage but little racial and economic diversity in the community: 93% of the population is African-American and 44% of households have an income less than \$15,000 (US Census Bureau, 2016). The targeted area has many indicators of a distressed community: high unemployment, high crime rates, high health disparity, and low affordable housing. The education disparity reflects the five targeted schools fall below proficiency in all academic areas compared to local, State, and federal level. The targeted schools are reflected by: high absenteeism, health disparities, low graduation rates, and high mobility. These schools have been identified as needing drastic improvement (p. e24-e37).

Weaknesses: No weaknesses identified in this section.

(2) The applicant addresses the criteria and provides a supporting map. The Upton/Druid Heights stretches one mile along Pennsylvania Avenue from its intersection at Martin Luther King Boulevard to the northern boundary at North Avenue and eastward to Eutaw Place. The largest public housing area is located within the targeted area to be served (p. e37-e39).

Weaknesses: No weaknesses identified in this section.

(3) The applicant addresses the criteria and provides evidence. The applicant is a recipient of the Promise Neighborhood planning grant. Through this planning grant the applicant was able to conduct lengthy interviews and meetings with targeted stakeholders. The result of these meetings concluded some of the following critical needs: student mental and behavioral health supports, teacher professional development, tutoring services, family engagement, Pre-K/K attendance, child development and early education supports. The applicant provides current data to illustrate the dire need of this targeted community (p. e39-e44).

Weaknesses: No weaknesses identified in this section.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 15

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 an extensive and through description of the pipeline services. Again, the applicant included all stakeholders in designing the services needed in the targeted community. The four domains of early learning, Pre-K-12, college and career, and family and community. The applicant has identified nine solutions which when variously applied across the four domains, will produce positive change in the sixteen identified indicators. All pipelines of services are seamless and ensure consistent transition from pre-K to career (p. e45-e89).

Weaknesses: No weaknesses identified in this section.

Strength

The applicant provides a strong evaluation which includes performance measures and intended outcomes. For example, Advocate at Systems level for simplified voucher process and additional slots for children under the age of 3. The applicant will address this by Increase from 12 slots to 61 slots by the end of year 5. The applicant provides performance measures for all activities an includes baseline data, funding cost per student and funding source (e311-e325).

Weaknesses: No weaknesses identified in this section.

Strength

The proposal's approach is based on strong theory and data regarding the choice of solutions, and how they fit with the challenges in this neighborhood, as well as a strong implementation framework. Theory rests on the undebatable impact of poverty on children's future. As noted in Section A3, Baltimore is the toughest place in the country for poor children to escape poverty The theoretical underpinnings rest on an understanding of how growing up in neighborhoods with high levels of poverty and social and family adversity help to explain poor health, academic achievement, education, and employment outcomes (Hair et al., 2015; Yoshikawa, Aber, & Beardslee, 2012). They believe that a reduction in social and family adversity and greater and early engagement of parents in more responsive parenting styles will help address sources of educational disadvantage. The provided theory enhances the overall delivery of appropriate services and will positively support the project (p. e89-e95).

Weaknesses: No weaknesses identified in this section.

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

Strength

The applicant partially addressed the criteria and provides evidence. For example, the applicant has designed structures and programs to recruit, retain and graduate underrepresented children and engage their families. There are mentoring programs, parental organization and staff development in place to assist in achieving academic success for traditionally underrepresented children (p. e96-e98).

Weaknesses: The applicant did not address how they will ensure access for disabled students.

Strength

The applicant provides a thorough and rigorous academic and social programs which, if implemented, will likely achieve desired outcome. The services are based on strong theory and systems are in place to ensure the success. The applicant has demonstrated strong and committed partnership who share their vision and support the objectives of the proposed project (p. e1-e1099).

Weaknesses: No weaknesses identified in this section.

Strength

The applicant fully addresses the criteria and provides evidence. The MOU's clearly outline the roles and responsibilities of the partnership and ensure data sharing. The partnerships include the State Education Office, City Mayoral Office, local and city government, and public and private organizations. Partners will be held accountable for performance in accordance with the MOU through execution of partner subcontract agreement. (p. e103-e109).

Weaknesses: No weaknesses identified in this section.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 19

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

Strength

The applicant fully addresses the criteria and provides evidence. The applicant demonstrates the capacity to meet all objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget. The organization structures has strong reporting mechanism and all positions have clearly defined roles and responsibilities. The applicant reports all activities with clear timelines, benchmarks and assigned staff. The MOU's clearly outline the roles and responsibilities of the partnership and ensure data sharing. The partnerships include the State Education Office, City Mayoral Office, local and city government, and public and private organizations (p. e103-e109).

Weaknesses: No weaknesses identified in this section.

Strength

The applicant provides a solid management plan with provisions on collecting, analyzing, and using data for decision making. Implementation of an effective management plan will be enhanced by further development of their existing management information approach. They will continue to manage its progress under the Results Based Accountability (RBA) process. RBA has been useful because it addresses population and performance results through using a common language, determining goals, establishing a shared understanding of the methods to achieve the identified goals, and agreeing on a shared responsibility in meeting those goals. The applicant will use RBA to assess progress in meeting agreed upon goals and to make modifications as needed. The PROMIS database management system will be used to enter, manage, track, and report data used to complete the RBA. The applicant will use the Promise Neighborhood results and indicators, plus one indicator added by leadership (the number and percentage of children involved with juvenile justice). The applicant ensures security and privacy are in place by all partner (p. e114-e115).

Weaknesses: No weaknesses identified in this section.

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 demonstrates the reasonableness of the cost in relations to the children to be served. The applicant thoroughly provides cost for each services delivery and provide a convincing strong argument for the cost (p. e126-e127).

Weaknesses: No weaknesses identified in this section.

Strength

The applicant fully addresses the criteria and provides evidence. For example, as resource developer, they bring previous successes and 50 years of institutional connections between the host institution (UMB) and City, State, and Federal partners. Using these tools they can facilitate the acquisition of public and private funding streams for which schools or other partners may not have the capacity or eligibility to apply. One of the main premises of this initiative is that sustainable, population-wide change can be achieved when a broad group of stakeholders combines and directs resources towards creating a system to address a common goal. The applicant has identified future funding sources such as HHS, Weinberg Foundation, and Krieger Family Foundation(p. e126-e128).

Weaknesses: No weaknesses identified in this section.

Strength

The applicant demonstrates the extent to which they identified existing neighborhood assets and program. The applicant provides a list of assets and a description of which programs they are currently funding. The support within the community crosses all sectors (p. e130-e137)

Weaknesses: No weaknesses identified in this section.

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 meets this priority. UMB was awarded a FY16 BCJI grant on September 26, 2016. The award period is from October 1, 2016 through September 30, 2019. The Promise Heights Promise Neighborhood is the lead agency for this grant. A signed and dated MOU was included in the application (p. e926-e928).

Weaknesses: No weaknesses identified in this section.

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.

The applicant meets this priority as documented by a memorandum of understanding attached in Appendix H, UMB is partnering with the Cecil County DFC Coalition (CCDFCC) to address opioid abuse prevention within the Promise Heights Promise Neighborhood. Cecil County was awarded a DFC Support Program grant award for the period from October 1, 2014 through September 30, 2019.(e24).

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 reviewed by an 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 this priority.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 0

[< Previous](#)

Review Cover Sheet

Panel Details

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

Panel Name Panel - 40

Applicant Name University of Maryland, Baltimore **PR/Award No** U215N170040

Questions

	Points Possible	Points Scored
1. Selection Criteria		
Need	15	15
Project Design	30	30
Project Services	20	19
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
TOTAL		6
GRAND TOTAL		105

Technical Review Form

Applicant Name University of Maryland, Baltimore **PR/Award No** U215N170040

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 describes several needs and social problems that they intend to address through their project. The applicant offers data from several sources that indicate the severity of the problems in the designated community. Exhibit 5 offers educational data for the youth in the Promise Neighborhood which demonstrates low attendance, chronic absenteeism and mobility that can have a direct impact on educational achievement (p.18). The applicant also demonstrates need through Exhibit 3 that presents standardized test scores for the youth in the geographic area for the project (p. 15). The applicant also includes several other indicators of need in the Upton/Druid Heights neighborhood in Exhibit 1, which demonstrates a community in both economic and social distress based on the high unemployment, high crime rates and poor health outcomes (p.7). The segmentation analysis used several needs assessment and offered further insights into the community strengths and needs that the applicant intends to address (pp. 20-25). The applicant provides tables in Appendix F that include the solutions based on the segmentation analysis results.

Weaknesses: None noted.

Strengths: The applicant provides a map of the geographic area to be served by the project (p. 19) and clearly defines the geographical area of the project. The Promise Neighborhood is located in the Upton/Druid Heights neighborhood near the center of Baltimore City, about one mile from the UMB SSW, 1.5 miles from the City's Inner Harbor (a renown waterfront commercial and residential area), and 1.25 miles from the Orioles and Ravens stadiums. The community includes almost 2000 families with 723 children under the age of 18 (p.7).

Weaknesses: None noted.

Strengths: The applicant describes the need and gaps regarding educational opportunities for youth and also employment opportunities for high school age youth and young adults. The gaps identified include lack of slots for after-school programs, the lack of pregnant women getting prenatal care and the need for more training for school personnel in trauma informed care for those students who have been exposed to violence in the community. The applicant also describes the opportunities to further the collaborations between the Promise Neighborhood partners to support the efforts to address the gaps in services and infrastructure. The gaps and needs are further discussed and described in the project design section of the application.

Weaknesses: None noted.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 15

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 describes an approach to service provision that focuses on four domains to address the gaps in community support for positive outcomes. The four domains include Early Learning, PreK-12, College and Career and Community and Family (pp. 31-59). The pipeline services include the needs assessment data, the solution strategy and the initial outcomes from the solution strategy. The applicant also describes the expansion based on the gaps in services and need for the service to support the project outcome achievement. The proposed plan is clear and grounded in need. For example, The College and Career solutions offered are focused specifically on the issues faced by the students in successfully transitioning to college and career. The applicant addresses the barriers gathered through both quantitative data and focus group results to create solution strategies to improve student preparation for college/career, retention in college/career and work study opportunities to remove the barrier of earning income to contribute to their families that the youth face. The applicant also intends to leverage free college/higher education opportunities for the students within the Promise Neighborhood.

Weaknesses: None noted.

Strengths: The applicant includes a data collection plan that employs both qualitative and quantitative data collection methods. The plan addresses several of the performance measures in the funding announcement. The applicant includes data report deliverables and how the data will be used to inform program implementation. The applicant also includes an impact study that will include a comparison group to determine impact on student outcomes (pp. 63-70). The impact study includes the incremental performance measures of student achievement in Exhibit 10 that are reasonable based on the baseline data, benchmarks and service delivery plan (p. 69).

Weaknesses: None noted.

Strengths: The applicant provides a logic model that includes the project components and the anticipated outcomes (pp. 75-76). The applicant further describes the four (4) tenets that underpin their service provision continuum that address the needs for the services within the community and the associated literature/research that supports their approaches to the service provision. The applicant also provides further details of their theory in Appendix G (pp. e-331-348). Exhibits 11 (p. 73) and

Exhibit 12 (p. 74) compare the implementation process in theory and in practice that demonstrates that the work takes an iterative approach and is at times a bit messy. The comparison offers clear insight into practice informed evidence as it relates to project design and implementation.

Weaknesses: None 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: The applicant provides their experience in ensuring access of underrepresented groups including African Americans and LGBTQI participants. The applicant includes a discussion about their adaptation of The National Standards for Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Health and Health Care to help guide their service accessibility processes (p.77) The applicant also addresses accessibility by recruiting and placing social workers and other staff from the service communities to implement the program.

Weaknesses: The applicant does not address accessibility for people with disabilities in their proposed strategies.

Strengths: The applicant offers support that the services are linked to student achievement improvements and provide the evidence for those expected improvement in Appendix G (pp. e-331-348). The applicant includes the academic standards and the incremental improvements of those standards in Exhibit 10 (p.69) and in the

evaluation section of the proposal in Exhibit 8 (p. 65).

Weaknesses: None noted.

Strengths: The applicant includes a description of each of the formal and informal partnerships for the project. The descriptions include the contributions of each of the partners and their roles in the project. The applicant also indicated which partners are BCJI grant recipient partners. Another strength of the application is the description of each of the partners' accountability systems that are in place for funding stewardship. The applicant also provides a description of the process for holding partners accountable for their components of the project and stewardship of the funding (pp.86-90). The MOU's in Appendix C (pp. e-226-242) also include the roles and responsibilities of each partner, how partners align on the theory of change and theory of action and the accountability system and process for the partnership. Another strength of the application is the description of the three partnership boards that will support the work through data informed decision making. The applicant includes the composition of the board, the roles and responsibilities of each of the boards, and the number of meetings and communication the boards will have throughout the grant period (p.90-91).

Weaknesses: None noted.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 19

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's PH organizational chart includes all of the components for the project and the management team has the requisite skill set to support a

successful project (p. 94 and Appendix B). The resumes of the applicant's team including the management team and the sub-recipients demonstrate strong capacity in bringing the project to fruition. The applicant also has previous experience with Promise Neighborhood planning grant that demonstrates experience with federal funding. The management plan in Appendix J clearly defines the timelines and milestones for accomplishing tasks described in the service provision section of the application (pp. e-968 to e-973).

Weaknesses: None noted

Strengths: The applicant included a thorough description of their plan to collect, analyze and use data for program implementation and continuous quality improvement. Exhibit 15 illustrates the various data information systems that will be used for data collection and analysis purposes. The applicant has an accountability system in place that relies on the management information systems data (p. 95). The applicant will use a score card framework to provide feedback on goal achievement and accountability that they intend to use to keep the project implementation on track and provide a data to action framework for using results. The applicant has a data sharing agreement in place with the partners and the PN staff are HIPPA certified. The data sharing agreement includes data security responsibilities of the partners (p. e-253).

Weaknesses: None 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: The applicant offers some economic impact information in the resources section. For example, the applicant describes the costs for the average lifetime cost of fatal child maltreatment (p. 107) and decreases in costs from the BMore parenting program in support of their program components. The applicant also includes the cost per pupil for community in schools based on the literature (p. 108). The costs per person are included in Appendix F by solution strategy. The costs appear to be reasonable based on the number of persons served and the anticipated results to the program participants and the community (pp. e 312-329). The tables in Appendix F provide an excellent example of including the solutions, number of people served, cost per person served, funding source, partners and population to be served based on the needs assessment and segmentation analysis.

Weaknesses: None noted.

Strengths: The applicant has over 7 years of collaborative partnerships with numerous partners. The applicant includes matched funds agreements from over 20 partners in Appendix C. The applicant includes strong letters of support and commitment from community partners as well as political figures that are critical to the projects long-term success. The project is also situated within a large university that can support the administrative structure needed to operate a successful project. The applicant also includes a Sustainability Board in their organizational chart (p. e-202). The applicant includes a statement that they will expand their partnerships to include additional federal, state and private funding sources (p. 110).

Weaknesses: None noted.

Strengths: The applicant has over 7 years of collaborative partnerships with numerous partners. The applicant includes matched funds agreements from over 20 partners in Appendix C. The applicant includes strong letters of support and commitment from community partners as well as political figures that are critical to the projects long-term success. The project is also situated within a large university that can support the administrative structure needed to operate a successful project. The applicant also includes a Sustainability Board in their organizational chart (p. e-202). The applicant includes a statement that they will expand their partnerships to include additional federal, state and private funding sources (p. 110).

Weaknesses: None 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: The applicant states that the footprint of their proposed project is within the same geographical boundaries as a BCJI awarded in 2016 (p.4). The applicant also indicates the BCJI partners within the partnership plan and the MOUs.

Weaknesses: None 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 provides a memorandum of understanding between it and the partners Cecil County that was awarded a DFC award for the grant period of 2014-2019 (Appendix H and p. 4).

Weaknesses: None 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.

This Competitive Preference Priority will be reviewed by an 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 this Competitive Preference Priority.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 0

[< Previous](#)

[^ Back to Top](#)

[\[FOIA \]](#) [\[Privacy \]](#) [\[Security \]](#) [\[Keyboard Tips \]](#) [\[Notices \]](#) © 2017 U.S. Department of Education

[Mobile Version](#) | [Full Site](#)

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

Technical Review Form

Applicant Name University of Maryland, Baltimore **PR/Award No** U215N170040

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 which describes the magnitude and severity of problems to be addressed by the proposed project. The applicant provides statistics from the 2011-2015 American Community Survey like the proposed community is ranked 55th of Baltimore City's 55 neighborhoods, 62% of children live below the poverty line, 28% of adults lack a high school diploma or equivalent, high unemployment rates (i.e., 6 out of 10 adults are unemployed), high rates of crime, students with low achievement, and residents with poor health (pg. e20-23 and e25-26).

Additionally, the applicant provides a detailed comparison chart of the proposed areas (i.e., Upton/Druid Heights) statistics versus Baltimore City (BC), Maryland (M), and United States (U.S.) such as percentage of single parent families, infant mortality rate, children living below poverty line, educational attainment (i.e., less than high school graduate or GED and high school graduate or GED), and violent crime rate. For example, single parent families U/DH-41%, BC-28%, M-19%, and U.S.-27%; children living below poverty lines U/DH-62%, BC-34%, M-13%, and U.S.-22%; and less than HS graduate or GED U/DH-28%, BC-17%, M-11%, and U.S.-13%.

Additionally, the applicant provides statistics like high teen birth rate (39.5%), poor access to preventative healthcare, high incidence of drugs and substance abuse (2,089 people died of overdose), high murder rates (344 deaths in 2016), neighborhood schools designated as priority schools by MSDE, and 95% of students receive free/reduced priced meals (pg. e26-30). Further, the applicant provides detailed tables with compelling statistics for five schools located in Upton/Druid Heights. Statistics include: School Readiness, AYP Proficiency scores, MSDE Priority Designations, and Attendance and Mobility (pg. e31-37).

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 that the Upton/Druid Heights neighborhood stretches one mile along Pennsylvania Avenue from the intersection at Martin Luther King Boulevard to the northern boundary at North Avenue and eastward to Eutaw Place, is near the center of Baltimore, and is home to 10,071 residents, 32% of which are children under the age of 18 (pg. e26 and 37). In addition, the applicant states that the proposed area houses one of the largest public housing projects in Baltimore (pg. e37-38). Lastly, the applicant provides a map of the proposed geographic area in the narrative (pg. e38).

Weaknesses:

No weakness noted.

Strengths:

The applicant provides evidence of its plan to improve services by implementing the proposed project that addresses specific gaps or weaknesses in services, infrastructure, or opportunities that will be addressed by the proposed project. For example, the applicant presents a plethora of methods, strategies, and techniques (i.e., focus group discussions, informant interviews, comprehensive surveys, U.S. Census, geographic segmentation analysis, etc.) to identify specific needs of residents and students and plan for the proposed project (pg. e39). For example, the applicant states that the proposed project will address children and student need (i.e., pre-k and kindergarten have highest rates of absenteeism), school need, child development and early

education supports (i.e., 38% of pregnant women begin prenatal care in the first trimester, 40% of children birth-five attend early childhood programs, etc.), family engagement, teacher professional development, and student mental and behavioral health support (pg. e40-44). The narrative in this section indicates that the applicant has thoroughly explored gaps and weaknesses in services and offers a well-justified rationale for addressing them through implementation of the proposed project (pg. e40-44).

Weaknesses:

No weakness noted.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 15

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

The applicant provides convincing information to describe how the proposed project is part of a comprehensive effort to create a complete pipeline of services, including early learning through grade 12, college- and career-readiness, and family and community supports.

The applicant provides details of using Promise Heights and Promise Neighborhoods strategies to improve outcomes for children and families. For example, the applicant presents details like employing licensed social workers, community residents leading initiatives and providing direct services, as

well as facilitating meetings and events with providers and organizations in the proposed community (pg. e45-47). In addition, the applicant states that consistent leadership allows for long-term planning and project implementation without gaps (pg. e47). Further, the applicant presents information of utilizing a Data Sharing Agreement as a foundation with all partners and includes the document in the Appendix as supporting evidence (pg. e47 and Appendix: pg. e245-264).

Further, the applicant provides details of its Theory of Change and Theory of Action for the proposed project in the narrative (pg. e47). The applicant includes a Promise Heights Results and Indicators table in the narrative that the proposed project will be formed around. The table provides detailed descriptions of indicators for each result (pg. e48-49). Lastly, the applicant states that its pipeline of services covers the four domains of early learning, pre-k-12, college and career, and family and community. The applicant provides the detailed implementation plan including costs, partner participation, sources of funds, children served, penetration rates, and growth rates in the Appendix (pg. e311-329). 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. e45-50).

Weakness:

No weakness noted.

Strength:

The applicant presents a comprehensive and well-developed plan for the collection, management, and analysis of data. The applicant states that it will utilize a Multi-Tier System of Support (MTSS) evidence based instruction, intervention, and assessment practices (pg. e51-52). Additionally, the applicant states that it will utilize the PROMIS data management system and the CSC and the Promise Corps will be responsible for monitoring and entering data into the database (pg. e51-52). The applicant states that all partners will use the PROMIS data system to enter all information related to the proposed project (pg. e51).

The applicant appears to have a working platform that will produce quantitative and qualitative data. For example, the applicant states that it will utilize Urban Institute (external evaluator) to conduct a formative evaluation of the proposed project. In addition, the applicant states that the results will drive adjustments to program plans (pg. e79). Other methods of evaluation include: focus groups, program observations and staff notes, process study reports, and neighborhood surveys (pg. e79-88). The applicant provides a detailed table that outlines the annual indicator goals for evaluating the progress of key systems of the proposed project (pg. e88-89).

Weakness:

No weakness noted.

Strength:

The proposed project is based on strong theory and a strong implementation framework (i.e., National Implementation Research Network). In addition, the applicant provides a NIRN implementation stages diagram in the narrative (pg. e92). The applicant includes a logic model in the narrative, as well as in the Appendix that provides details of resource inputs, activities, outputs, short-term results, medium-term results, and long-term results and evidence for each identified key area (i.e., early childhood, elementary, middle, and high school, college and career, and family and community supports) 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. e94-95 and Appendix: pg. e903).

Weakness:
No weakness 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

Strength:

The applicant provides convincing information to show how the proposed project will ensure equal access and treatment for eligible project participants. For example, it is the applicant's intent to employ the National Standards for Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services (CLAS) in Health and Health Care to ensure disparities are adequately addressed throughout the proposed project (pg. e96-97). Additionally, the applicant provides a comprehensive and detailed evidence table of strategies to be used in the Appendix, some of which include: developmental screenings, parent education programs, high-quality after-school programs, and mentoring (pg. 97-98 and Appendix: pg. e331-348). Further, the applicant states that The Positive School Center will train educators on cultural competency, equity, school climate, and school discipline (pg. e96).

Weakness:

The applicant did not provide details of how it will ensure equal access and treatment for eligible project participants who are disabled.

Strength:

The applicant states that rigorous academic standards are core to its work as well as its partners (pg. e98). The applicant provides narrative depicting how the proposed project's evidence-based strategies and activities will lead to success. The applicant proposes a high-quality solution plan that clearly identifies each key learning solution, strategies, program, evidence, citation outcomes, and relevance to the proposed project (pg. e331-349). Strategies include: high-quality academic instruction, parenting programs, utilization of iReady, and providing case management and financial education (pg. e98-102). Additionally, the applicant includes a detailed implementation table in the Appendix with details of partner participation, costs and source of funds, number of children served per solution, penetration rate and growth plans (Appendix: pg. e312-329). 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 propose project. It is the applicant's intent to utilize both informal and formal partnerships as well as board (i.e., accountability, sustainability, and community) to implement the proposed project (pg. e103). Additionally, the applicant states that boards will meet monthly, quarterly, and bi-annually, to advise on funding opportunities, strategic operational planning, partner performance, and progress towards indicators (pg. e103-105). The applicant provides detailed narrative of each proposed community partner organization as well as includes letters of commitment in the Appendix (pg. e103-109).

Further, the applicant provides a copy of the proposed MOU to be signed by each partner in the Appendix as supporting evidence that includes details like the vision, theories of change and action, governance and decision-making, details of each board, partner commitments, and programmatic commitments (Appendix: pg. e226-244). The applicant provides details of partner participation on the implementation table in the Appendix (Appendix: pg. e312-329). Lastly, the applicant has accountability plans in place should an organization not meet deliverables. For example, the applicant states that partner participation will be monitored and if deliverables are not met, program improvement plans are implemented (pg. e105-106). 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: 19

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

Strength:

The applicant states that University of Maryland Baltimore will be responsible for oversight of the proposed project and includes details of their success in managing other large grants. The applicant states that it will employ its current organizational and staffing structure for meeting goals and objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget (pg. e109-113). The proposed project management plan is comprehensive and reflects the project design currently utilized by UMB as noted in the narrative (pg. e109-113). Additionally, the applicant provides a diagram of the proposed governance structure within the narrative (pg. e113).

The applicant clearly identifies key personnel for the proposed grant (i.e., Executive Director, Assistant Director, Chief Research Advisor, Director of Research and Evaluation, Director of Community Schools, etc.) as well as provides a brief description of the role for each position in the budget justification (Appendix: pg. e1029-1036). Additionally, the applicant provides resumes and job descriptions in the appendices of the proposed key personnel for the project as supporting evidence that the management plan will be able to achieve objectives of the proposed project (Appendix: pg. e146-224).

The proposed project will utilize seasoned leaders associated with UMB, most notably the Executive Director, Director of Evaluation and Research, Chief Research Advisor and the Assistant Director (pg. e113). Utilizing personnel from previous grants will decrease time normally associated with start-up of a new project because of their expertise and familiarity with the proposed project design.

The applicant provides a clearly defined timeline with timelines and responsibilities for accomplishing project tasks. The applicant includes a timing implementation and management timeline table in the Appendix with a timeframe of when each identified concern would be implemented (Appendix: pg. e312-329 and 968-974).

Weakness:

No weakness noted.

Strength:

The applicant proposes a well-developed plan for collecting, analyzing, and using data. The applicant states that it will manage its progress using the Results Based Accountability (RBA) process and the PROMIS database management system will be used to enter, manage, track, and report data (pg. e114-115). Further, the applicant states that it will use state of the art data collection, evaluation, dissemination techniques, and 21st century information technology to support on-going use of data to drive program provision and improvement (pg. e115). Tracking indicators include: tracking children and families, measure outcomes, evaluate partners, track GPRA's and facilitate longitudinal analysis of program inputs and participant outcomes (pg. e117-119).

The applicant states that measures will be tracked quarterly and annually, compared to regional and national benchmarks, and outcome monitoring will be used to make continuous improvements to all proposed project activities (pg. e118-121). Additionally, the applicant includes a Promise Neighborhood Proposal Data System diagram in the narrative to show the proposed plan for data integration (pg. e117). The applicant states its intent to use Qualtrics (i.e., survey software) to collect data on services offered and analyze outcomes (pg. e118). Lastly, the applicant states that its Institutional Review Board, Administration, and Governing Board will ensure that it abides by all privacy laws and requirements (pg. e123).

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:

Strengths:

The costs appear to be reasonable in relation to the number of persons to be served. The applicant is requesting \$29,570,472 in Promise Neighborhood funds to serve the proposed communities. The applicant proposes to do so by leveraging and layering resources through partnerships to ensure that families are efficiently served and services are not duplicated (pg. e125). In addition, using the OST Cost Calculator the proposed project cost per slot ranges from \$778 to \$2,865 (pg. 125) which seems to be reasonable to produce the anticipated results and benefits. Further, the applicant presents a comprehensive and detailed budget and 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. e1029-1099).

Weaknesses:

No weakness noted.

Strengths:

The applicant presents a convincing plan for sustainability by describing how it will use its previous successes, connections with city, state, and federal partners, and its ability to facilitate the acquisition of public and private funding streams (pg. e128-129) to sustain the proposed project. In addition, the applicant states that it will continue to use its resources to expand partnerships and have identified several funding streams some of which include: SAMHSA, ACF, Wells Fargo, and Krieger Family Foundation (pg. e129). The applicant provides further assurance of its ability to sustain the proposed project by utilizing funds through relationships with state agencies (i.e., Ohio Department of Medicaid and Department of Education), state of Ohio, and multi-sector partners (pg. e128).

Weaknesses:

No weakness noted.

Strengths:

The applicant provides a detailed description of each identified asset and program in the narrative (pg. e45-78). 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. e45-78). The applicant provides detailed tables for each solution (early learning, pre-k-12, college and career, and family and community) that provide details of the need, solution, evidence, strategy, and direct service staff responsible. Additionally, the applicant identifies initiatives that will support the proposed project some of which include: B'More for Healthy Babies, Parent University, Seeds of Promise: Transforming Black Boys into Men Mentoring, Blooms Promise: Strength in Sisterhood, and Center for Urban Families (pg. e45-78). These components indicate that the applicant thoroughly researched and identified existing neighborhood assets and programs in the identified communities that will be used to implement the pipeline of services.

Weaknesses:

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.

Strengths:

The applicant demonstrates that it has received a BCJI grant. For example, the applicant provides details of that it was awarded a FY16 BCJI grant award and that the award is for October 1, 2016 through September 30, 2019 (pg. e23). In addition, the applicant provides a copy of the FY16 Byrne Criminal Justice Innovation Program Grant in the Appendix as supporting documentation (Appendix: pg. e914-925).

Weaknesses:

The reviewer found no weakness in this sub-criterion.

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 plans to partner with the Cecil County DFC Coalition (CCDFCC) to address opioid abuse prevention within the Promise Heights Promise Neighborhood (pg. e24). In addition, the applicant states that Cecil County was awarded a DFC Support Program grant award for the period of October 1, 2014 through September 30, 2019 (pg. e24). Further, the applicant includes a copy of the memorandum of understanding between it and the CCDFCC in the Appendix as supporting evidence to meet this competitive preference priority (pg. e926).

Weaknesses:

The reviewer found no weakness in this competitive preference priority.

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 CPP 4.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 0

[< Previous](#)