U.S. Department of Education
Office of Career, Technical, and Adult Education
Washington, D.C. 20202-6200

Fiscal Year 2014

Application for New Awards
Performance Partnership Pilots

CFDA 84.420

Dated Material - Open Immediately

Closing Date:

Approved OMB Number: 1830-XXX
Expiration Date: XX/XX/XXXX

Paperwork Burden Statement

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is: 1830-XXXX. Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 80 hours per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data resources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. The obligation to respond to this collection is required to obtain or retain benefit.

If you have comments or concerns regarding the status of your individual submission of this form, write directly to: Braden Goetz, Office of Career, Technical, and Adult Education, 550 12th Street, SW, Room 11-141, Washington, District of Columbia 20202 Note: Please do not return the completed application to this address.

Table of Contents

Dear Colleague:

Thank you for your interest in the Performance Partnership Pilots (P3) program, a unique interagency initiative to improve outcomes for the over 5 million estimated 14-to-24-year-olds in the U.S. who are not working or in school and who, in many cases, face the additional challenges of being homeless, in foster care, or involved in the justice system. Authorized by the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2014, P3 will enable up to ten pilot sites to test innovative, outcome-focused strategies to achieve significant improvements in educational, employment, and other key outcomes for disconnected youth using new flexibility to blend existing Federal funds and to seek waivers of associated program requirements. P3 pilots also will receive grants to support start-up activities, such as planning, streamlined governance, strengthened data infrastructure, improved coordination, and related activities to help pilots improve outcomes for disconnected youth.

Please take the time to review the competitive preference priorities, application requirements, selection criteria, and all of the application instructions thoroughly. An application will not be evaluated for funding if the applicant does not comply with all of the procedural rules that govern the submission of the application or the application does not contain the information required under the program (EDGAR §75.216 (b) and (c)).

For this competition it is **mandatory** for applicants to use the government-wide website, Grants.gov (http://www.grants.gov), to apply. We strongly encourage you to familiarize yourself with Grants.gov and recommend that you register *and* submit early.

Applications submitted to Grants.gov for the Department of Education will now be posted using Adobe forms. Therefore, applicants will need to download the latest version of Adobe reader (Grants.gov recommends Adobe Reader 10.1.14). Please review the **Submitting Applications with Adobe Reader Software** and **Education Submission Procedures and Tips for Applicants** forms found within this package for further information and guidance related to this requirement.

Please visit our program website at http://findyouthinfo.gov/youth-topics/reconnecting-youth/performance-partnership-pilots for further information. If you have any questions about the program after reviewing the application package, please contact Braden Goetz at 202-245-7405, or by email at disconnectedyouth@ed.gov.

Sincerely,

Johan E. Uvin
Acting Assistant Secretary for Career,

Technical, and Adult Education

Program Background Information

Program Overview

P3 offers a unique opportunity to test innovative, cost-effective, and outcome-focused strategies for improving results for disconnected youth. Through these pilots, we hope to learn more about whether providing additional flexibility for States, localities, and Indian tribes to pool funds and waive programmatic requirements will help them overcome some of the significant hurdles they may face in improving outcomes for disconnected youth.

The Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2014 (Public Law 113-76) (the Act), under Section 526 of Division H, authorizes the Departments of Education, Labor, and Health and Human Services, the Corporation for National and Community Service and the Institute of Museum and Library Services (collectively, the Agencies), to enter into a total of up to ten Performance Partnership Agreements with States, localities, or tribal governments receiving funds under multiple Federal programs that give grantees additional flexibility in using these funds to achieve significant improvement in outcomes for disconnected youth. In the Act, "'to improve outcomes for disconnected youth'" means to increase the rate at which individuals between the ages of 14 and 24 (who are low-income and either homeless, in foster care, involved in the juvenile justice system, unemployed, or not enrolled in or at-risk of dropping out of an educational institution) achieve success in meeting educational, employment, or other key goals." (Section 526(a)(2) of Division H of the Act).

Below are key features of P3 authority and brief descriptions of how they will support pilots in achieving better outcomes.

Blending Funds

The P3 pilots are designed to facilitate flexible use of existing Federal funding streams that were made available under the Act, such as certain competitive and formula grants. The theory of action behind P3 is that blending funds and providing additional flexibility should enable pilots to improve outcomes for disconnected youth by reducing administrative burdens and helping to overcome administrative hurdles. When funds are blended, individual funding streams, or portions of the funding streams, are merged under a single set of reporting and other requirements, losing their award-specific identity. P3 should thereby enhance pilot sites' capability to effectively use resources from multiple Federal funding streams--and potentially State, tribal, local, and philanthropic funding streams as well--such as by enabling pilot sites to better align project objectives, delivery of services, measurement strategies, and reporting.

The pilots must involve Federal programs focused on serving disconnected youth or designed to prevent youth from disconnecting from school or work, and that provide education, training, employment, and other related social services. Thus, under the Act, States, localities, and tribes that enter into a P3 agreement may blend certain fiscal year (FY) 2014 discretionary funds, including both formula and competitive grant funds, from the Agencies in order to implement outcome-focused strategies for serving disconnected youth. Blended Federal funds involved in a

pilot will be used in accordance with a performance partnership agreement entered into between a lead Federal agency and the respective representatives of all State, local, and tribal governments participating in that pilot. In addition, where funding streams from certain Federal programs are not eligible or suitable for blending under P3, pilots may also consider how to braid these funding streams, or how to align them in other ways that promote more effective and efficient outcomes while maintaining the separate identity of each funding stream. A pilot may involve both blended and braided funds.

In general, the pilots are intended to facilitate flexible use of existing Federal funding streams. However, the Agencies have identified FY 2014 funds under existing authorities that the Department will pool to award to pilots as start-up grants. These grants will help to support each pilot's start-up costs, such as activities related to planning, governance, and coordination. Applicants must describe in their proposals how they will use the start-up funds, along with the funds the applicants propose to blend under the Performance Partnerships authority, to develop and implement high-quality Performance Partnership Pilots to improve outcomes for disconnected youth.

Waivers

In order to provide applicants with the flexibility required to implement a pilot through the effective blending of Federal and non-Federal funds, the Act provides that the Agencies may waive programmatic requirements. P3 authority states that heads of the Agencies may not only exercise any existing waiver authority, but may also waive any statutory, regulatory, or administrative requirement that they are otherwise not authorized to waive, so long as the waiver is in keeping with important safeguards. Specifically, waivers must be consistent with the statutory purposes of the respective Federal programs contributing funds to the pilot and necessary to achieve the pilot's outcomes. In addition, the Agencies may not waive requirements related to nondiscrimination, wage and labor standards, and allocation of funds to State and substate levels.

In practice, P3 waiver authority should enable applicants to take a more outcome-focused approach to providing services by first, identifying the population to be served; second, determining the most effective strategies for serving that population; third, selecting funding streams appropriate to support those strategies; and, lastly, clarifying which program rules and requirements would need to be waived in order to implement the strategies. The waiver authority will allow communities and the Federal government to identify eligible youth and design the allowable activities and reporting requirements so that they support the goals and objectives of the pilot as determined at the State, local, and/or tribal level.

Performance Partnership Agreements

Each pilot will be governed by a performance agreement between a lead Federal agency and the respective representatives of all of the State, local, or tribal governments participating in the pilot. OMB has designated the Department of Education as the lead agency for purposes of

administering P3 start-up grants. OMB may also designate an additional lead Federal agency for each pilot on the basis of the programs included and/or the outcomes sought in the pilot.

<u>Limitations</u>

Before any of the Agencies can participate in a Performance Partnership Pilot, the agency head must determine, in writing, that the agency's participation in the pilot (1) will not result in denying or restricting the eligibility of any individual for any of the services that (in whole or in part) are supported by the agency's programs and Federal discretionary funds that are involved in the Pilot, and (2) based on the best available information, will not otherwise adversely affect vulnerable populations that receive those services. Applicants for P3 will describe how their proposals align with these requirements, which are described further in the FAQ portion of this application package.

The Act does not provide authority for pilots to blend funding or waive provisions of Federal programs funded with mandatory appropriations, such as Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) or Medicaid. However, the performance agreements must identify any statutory, regulatory, or administrative requirements related to programs funded with mandatory appropriations that pilot sites determine would be barriers to achieving the pilot's outcomes. Pilots also do not extend to programs funded outside of the Act, such as those administered by the Department of Justice and the Department of Housing and Urban Development. However, pilot jurisdictions may seek waivers or administrative flexibility already authorized under programs administered by these other agencies in order to improve their coordination and alignment with the pilot project.

Flexibility Template

As described in the Notice Inviting Applications (NIA), P3 applicants are required to describe the Federal flexibility, including blended funding and waivers, needed to implement the proposed pilot and to improve outcomes for the target population, focusing on changes to major program requirements that would otherwise inhibit implementation. Examples of potential requests for flexibility include, but are not limited to, changes to eligibility requirements, allowable uses of funds, or performance reporting. Applicants must cite the specific Federal statutory, regulatory, or other requirements for which they are requesting flexibility. <u>Note</u>: The waiver request process for P3 differs from standard agency processes. Applicants need not submit separate waiver requests or information to the respective agencies outside of the P3 application process.

To assist applicants and their partners in preparing to respond to the NIA, we are providing a template to help think through, organize, and document the information that is needed for the NIA to request flexibility in P3 pilots. This template is only meant to help guide applicants and is not required for consideration under P3. **You do not need to submit this template with your application**.

<u>Flexibility to Carry Out New, Modified, or Streamlined Activities to Advance Outcomes for Disconnected Youth More Efficiently and Effectively</u>. Discuss how the Federal flexibility proposed in your application, including blending funds and other waivers, will enable your pilot to carry out new activities, to modify existing activities, or to streamline activities across programs. Explain how these changes will reduce barriers, increase efficiency, support implementation of the pilot, and help produce significantly better outcomes for the target population(s).

I. **<u>Flexibility to Discontinue Activities or Other Program Requirements to Advance Outcomes for Disconnected Youth More Efficiently and Effectively</u>**. Discuss the activities or requirements from specific Federal programs that you would no longer implement under your proposed pilot. Explain why these activities and requirements have posed barriers, inhibited efficiency, or otherwise hindered successful achievement of outcomes for the target population of disconnected youth that would be served by your pilot. Explain why removing these requirements or activities would not have a detrimental effect on vulnerable populations currently served by the program or those who would be served by your pilot.

The table below is intended to present clearly the programs and requirements for which flexibility is requested and the alternate accountability mechanisms proposed.

Federal Program under which flexibility is requested	Flexibility Requested, including citations of relevant statutory, regulatory, or other requirements	Alternate Accountability Mechanisms, such as outcomes measures, interim indicators, or modified reporting

Frequently Asked Questions

A. Public Input

A-1.   How did the Administration seek input from the field to help develop P3?

Throughout development of P3, the Administration relied on extensive consultation with diverse stakeholders. For example, stakeholder input was solicited through the White House Council on Community Solutions; implementation of Executive Order 13563, Improving Regulation and Regulatory Review; the President's February 28, 2011 Memorandum on Administrative Flexibility, Lower Costs, and Better Results for State, Local, and Tribal Governments; and, most recently, the Request for Information on Strategies for Improving Outcomes for Disconnected Youth (RFI) that was published in the *Federal Register* on June 4, 2012 (77 FR 32959).[1]

The consultations yielded valuable insights from practitioners, youth advocates, and others on the front lines of service delivery. These diverse stakeholders pointed to significant challenges to effective service delivery for young people who are struggling to make successful transitions to adulthood. Among other factors, these challenges include: limited evidence and knowledge of what works; poor coordination and alignment across the systems that serve youth; policies that make it difficult to target the neediest youth and overcome gaps in services; fragmented data systems that inhibit the flow of information to improve results; and administrative requirements that impede holistic approaches to serving youth who are disconnected.

Stakeholders agreed that addressing many of these challenges often requires services and expertise from multiple systems, including schools, health and mental health, workforce development, job training, housing, social services, and criminal justice. Disconnected youth may achieve better outcomes when programs are coordinated and resources are well-targeted.

B. Eligibility

B-1. May Territories (American Samoa, Guam, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and the Virgin Islands) apply for P3 along with States, Tribes, and localities?

Yes, if the applicant, whether directly or through one of its agencies or entities: (1) is wholly or partly administering a Federal program; (2) is classified as a State or local government for purposes of that Federal program; and (3) proposes to include that Federal program in the pilot.

B-2. What role can nonprofits play in applying for or implementing a P3 pilot?

---

[1] The RFI is available at www.federalregister.gov/articles/2012/06/04/2012-13473/request-for-information-on-strategies-for-improving-outcomes-for-disconnected-youth.

A nonprofit organization may not serve as the pilot applicant or the fiscal agent for pilot implementation, but it still may play a significant role in the design and governance of a performance partnership pilot. For example, a nonprofit may:

- Facilitate the development of the pilot and prepare the application;
- Deliver services and coordinate service delivery under the pilot;
- Oversee broader implementation of the pilot, including providing progress updates and recommended course corrections to activities administered by government partners;
- Represent the State, local, or tribal partnership in meetings, communications, and negotiations with the Federal government on matters when all the partners, including the Federal government, agree that this is an appropriate role for the nonprofit; and
- Secure commitments from philanthropy, other nonprofit organizations, academic and research organizations, employers, or other private sector organizations.

When a performance partnership proposal envisions a role for nonprofits in the pilot, the applicant should clearly explain the proposed responsibilities of the nonprofit organizations, their role(s) in the governance structure, and their prior experience in successful collaboration with the participating State, local, and/or tribal governments. Nonprofits may be signatories to a performance agreement along with—but not instead of—participating State, local, and/or tribal government representatives. In these cases, the State, local, and/or tribal governments will continue to be the parties primarily responsible for meeting the terms of the partnership agreement. More information about the circumstances under which participating nonprofits may be signatories will be made available in the solicitation and during the application review process and may depend in part on the specifics of individual pilot proposals.

B-3. Must an Indian tribe be federally recognized to be eligible to apply for P3?

No. State-recognized Indian tribes, as well as tribes recognized by the Federal government, are eligible to apply.

C. Waivers

C-1. What kinds of waivers will Federal agencies consider? Are there specific waivers that will not be considered?

The Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2014 ((the Act; P.L. 113-76, Div. H, §526, Jan. 17, 2014; 128 Stat. 413)) provides broad waiver authority for P3 projects. The Act allows the heads of affected Federal agencies to waive statutory, regulatory, and other requirements that they are otherwise authorized to waive, as well as those that they might not otherwise be authorized to waive. The affected agencies are the Departments of Education (ED), Labor (DOL), and Health and Human Services (HHS), along with the Corporation for National and Community Service (CNS) and the Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS) (collectively, the Agencies). With respect to requirements that the Agencies might not otherwise be authorized to waive, the Act includes important safeguards that applicants and the Agencies must meet (see sections 526(d) and (f)). Specifically, those waiver requests must be: consistent with the statutory purposes of that program; necessary to achieve the pilot's outcomes and no broader in scope than

necessary; and able to result in efficiencies or increased ability of individuals to obtain access to services provided by those Federal program funds. Requirements related to nondiscrimination, wage and labor standards, and allocations of funds to State and sub-State levels cannot be waived. In addition, the heads of the Agencies must determine that their agency's participation and the use of proposed program funds: (1) will not result in denying or restricting individual eligibility for services funded by those programs, and (2) will not adversely affect vulnerable populations that are the recipients of those services (see FAQs C-2 and C-3 for more information).

The Agencies will consider waiver requests on a case-by-case basis in the context of the applicant's full pilot proposal and these statutory protections. During the technical review, applicants will be scored, in part, based on the extent to which they: (1) demonstrate that the requirements for which they are seeking waivers are hindering successful achievement of outcomes for the target population of disconnected youth who are identified for the proposed pilot; and (2) provide a justification of how the waivers, individually or together, will reduce barriers, increase efficiency, support implementation of the pilot, and produce significantly better outcomes for the target population. Applicants should focus waiver requests on changes to major program requirements that would otherwise inhibit implementation. Examples of waivers include changes to eligibility requirements, allowable uses of funds, or performance reporting.

Following the technical review, the top-scoring applications will undergo a flexibility review of the applicant's proposed waivers by interagency teams. Representatives of the Agency from which program flexibility is sought will evaluate whether the waivers requested by top-scoring applicants, in addition to the proposed blending of program funds, meet the statutory requirements for Performance Partnership Pilots, and are otherwise appropriate. For example, if an applicant is seeking flexibility under programs administered by HHS and DOL, its requests for flexibility will be reviewed by HHS and DOL officials; and these DOL and HHS officials will determine the appropriateness of the flexibility request. During the flexibility review process, applicants may also be asked to participate in an interview in order to clarify requests for waivers and other flexibility, and potentially other aspects of their proposals.

C-2. Section 526(d) of the Act states that funds must not be blended in a pilot if doing so would result in "denying or restricting the eligibility of any individual for any of the services" of a program whose funding is proposed to be blended in the pilot. What should an applicant consider in ensuring that it complies with this requirement?

Under standard practice in many Federal programs and as permissible under the authorizing statute, the entire eligible population does not actually receive services each year or grant cycle. Eligibility requirements set an outer boundary for the target population, but program design, funding, or other limitations may result in services being delivered to only a subset of the eligible population. If allowed under the relevant statute or regulations, grantees may focus activities on a limited subset of the eligible population. This means that, even in programs in which funds are allocated to grantees based on the identification of specific types of individuals, there is no guarantee that each identified individual will receive services.

Similarly under P3, applicants may propose to focus their activities either on a limited subset of the eligible population of a particular program or on a broader eligible population without

"denying or restricting the eligibility" of the individuals to receive services. An applicant may propose to blend a portion of funding from a program to serve a target population that differs from the program's exact statutory eligibility requirements. An applicant may do so by either proposing to waive eligibility requirements to broaden the target population, or proposing to work with a targeted subpopulation of a particular program.

One important factor for applicants to consider is how much a proposal will affect the proportion of eligible individuals who actually receive services under a particular program (including existing program-funded services as well as any new or comparable services provided under the pilot). For example, an applicant could violate this provision if it proposes to blend all or most of the funds of a particular program, but would serve only a very limited subset of that program's eligible population, as defined in the program's authorizing statute, through its P3 activities. Such a proposal could deny or restrict the eligibility of individuals for service of a program because its implementation could directly result in the vast majority of a program's eligible population not receiving services.

C-3. Section 526(d) of the Act states that funds must not be blended in a pilot if doing so would result in "adversely affect[ing] vulnerable populations that are the recipients of such services" of a program whose funding is proposed to be blended in the pilot. What should applicants consider in ensuring that they comply with this requirement?

The Agencies have determined that there are at least two situations in which a proposed blending of funds would result in an adverse effect on the recipients of services under a particular program. The first situation involves a program that creates a universal entitlement that enables all eligible individuals to receive services or benefits. Funding from such programs may not be blended under a pilot if the pilot would serve only a subset of the eligible participants, thereby adversely affecting the remaining participants. The second situation involves programs that provide individuals with direct benefits (such as vouchers, credits, scholarships, or other payments). Funding from these programs may not be blended under a pilot under any circumstances because such a pilot would adversely affect the recipients of the direct benefit.

For all programs for which a pilot applicant proposes to blend funds or seek waivers, the applicant must describe how it will ensure in its pilot proposal that the recipients of services under the original program will receive a level of services or maintain a level of outcomes comparable to what would occur in the absence of the P3 activities. In considering whether blending funds would adversely affect the recipients of services funded by the original program, the applicant should also consider whether there are other non-mandatory Federal funds or non-Federal funds that will be used to continue to serve the recipients.

C-4. What factors must an applicant consider in justifying its waiver requests?

An applicant must provide strong justification that the new approach that would result from any waivers or other flexibility is necessary to achieve the outcomes of the pilot, is no broader in scope than is necessary to achieve those outcomes, and will result in either (1) realizing efficiencies by simplifying reporting burdens or reducing administrative barriers with respect to such discretionary funds; or (2) increasing the ability of individuals to obtain access to services that are provided by such discretionary funds. (See Section 526(f)(2)(B) of the Act.) Applicants

must provide this description in response to Selection Criterion (B) in the P3 notice inviting applications (NIA).

D. Competitive Grants

D-1. Can FY 2014 competitive grants be included in a P3 Pilot?

The Agencies will consider the inclusion of FY 2014 competitive grant funds that have already been awarded on a case-by-case basis. The Agencies will determine if the scope, objectives, and target population(s) of the grant appropriately and sufficiently align with the scope objectives, and target populations of the proposed pilot. Situations in which it may be appropriate to include an already-awarded competitive grant or grants in a pilot include cases in which there are similarities between the competitive grant and the proposed pilot, such as the project plan, performance goals and metrics, proposed participants, leveraging of diverse funding, and partnership approaches, and an increased potential to amplify an existing program model and improve outcomes for disconnected youth.

Situations in which it may not be appropriate to include already-awarded competitive grant funds in a P3 pilot include cases in which, for example, the competitive grant is undergoing a rigorous evaluation that could be negatively affected or interrupted by the inclusion in the P3 pilot. Additional situations in which it might not be appropriate include if the competitive grant had been awarded based on a proposal to serve a specific population that would not align with the pilot's proposed target population, or if the proposed pilot approach could, in any way, adversely affect that targeted population or the overall goals of the competitive grant.

The Agencies will consider the strength of the applicant's justification for including the already-awarded competitive grant funds in its proposed P3 pilot. This requires the applicant to clearly demonstrate that the scope, objectives, and target population(s) of the competitive grant appropriately and sufficiently align with the proposed pilot's scope, objectives, and target population(s). The applicant must also justify any potential changes in terms and conditions of the existing competitive grant that may be required for the purposes of the pilot (such as allowable costs and activities).

E. Needs Assessment

E-1. What is a comprehensive needs assessment, and how will it inform my P3 pilot?

In general, a comprehensive needs assessment is a systematic process to develop an informed understanding of the gaps or needs that exist, as well as the factors or root causes that contribute to the existence of those needs. A needs assessment first defines the scope of the assessment and may outline key questions to be answered by the assessment. Next, it gathers data to analyze and document findings, which may include strengths, gaps, opportunities, and challenges. Using this information, and other applicable evidence-based research, the assessment then establishes priorities and strategies for addressing the identified issues.

The Agencies acknowledge the diversity in definitions and processes for conducting a needs assessment. One example of a specific type and process for conducting a needs assessment is the

community needs assessments described by HHS, Administration for Children & Families (ACF), at www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/ocs/resource/conducting-a-community-assessment-1#Overview.

While a specific model or process is not required, the P3 review process includes consideration of the extent to which the applicant used a comprehensive needs assessment that was conducted or updated (either by the applicant or by other partners or organizations) within the past three years. The needs assessment should use representative data on disconnected youth in the jurisdiction(s) to be served by the pilot that are disaggregated according to relevant demographic factors (such as race, ethnicity, gender, age, and disability status) to: (a) show disparities in outcomes among key sub-populations; and (b) identify an appropriate target population of disconnected youth with a high level of need. For example, a comprehensive needs assessment that an applicant conducts or uses for purposes of this application may analyze workforce, education, and well-being data for disconnected youth in defined areas of service and identify a target population with significant outcome disparities in comparison to other peer groups. Applicants, especially those that are conducting a needs assessment for purposes of the P3 application, are encouraged to align priorities and next steps identified through the needs assessment to the pilot logic model in order to inform the overall project design (See FAQ F-1, Logic Models).

F. Logic Models

F-1. What is a logic model, and what information should it include?

A logic model (also referred to as theory of action) is a well-specified conceptual framework that identifies key components of the proposed process, product, strategy, or practice (i.e., the "active ingredients'' that are hypothesized to be critical to achieving the relevant outcomes) and describes the relationships among the key components and outcomes, theoretically and operationally (34 CFR 77.1). In other words, a logic model clarifies what the applicant is seeking to change or produce through the pilot—the expected results, and the intermediate and long-term outcomes—and identifies how the project's activities will contribute to achieving that result.

As described in the NIA, P3 applicants are required to submit a graphic (no longer than one page) that depicts the pilot's logic model grounded in a specific theory of change for how the pilot's strategy will produce intended outcomes. The first step in developing a theory of change, after identifying the issue(s) to be addressed, is to identify the theoretical solution(s) based on available data. The next step is to describe the desired outcomes and impacts in addressing the issue and develop a plan for attaining those goals. Using this information, a logic model communicates how the program would operate when implemented. A variety of frameworks are used to describe the parts of a logic model, and P3 does not require a specific model. However, applicants are encouraged to include the following elements in their logic model.

    a. **Inputs** include the resources that are needed to carry out the program plans. Examples of inputs are personnel, facilities, funding streams, supplies, and equipment.

b. **Activities** are the services and interventions that are proposed as part of the program design. It is helpful to consult evidence from the field regarding the effectiveness of the activities in achieving the desired outcomes and goals. It should be clear from your logic model how the key components are related to, or expected to produce, the outputs that ultimately lead to the intervention's intermediate and longer-term outcomes.

c. **Outputs** are the immediate results or products of the project activities, which are often (but not always) described in numerical terms. For example, outputs might include the number of youth who complete a certification program.

d. **Interim indicators** are goals that the intervention is expected to help achieve that lead to achievement of long-term outcomes. It may be helpful to include indicators that encompass different levels (such as participant-level, organizational-level, or system-level outcomes) and across time (such as short-term and long-term).

e. **Long-term outcomes** are the expected changes in behavior, attitudes, aptitude/skill, knowledge, etc. for the target population. In particular, because these pilots are intended to improve outcomes for disconnected youth, long-term outcomes are related to reconnection of youth or successful prevention of disconnection, including by ensuring youth are enrolled in school or gainfully employed.

Logic models may also show assumptions made by the applicant, as well as any external factors that may bear on the intermediate and long-term outcomes. These elements provide context for the proposed interventions.

For additional information on how to develop a logic model, see DOL's Workforce3One Web site: www.workforce3one.org/view/3001135636811349576/info or "Evaluation Toolkit for Prospective WIF Grantees", starting on page 10: www.doleta.gov/workforce_innovation/pdf/grantees/FINAL_WIF_EvaluationToolkit_5-12-2014.pdf. The Regional Educational Laboratory Pacific, one of the 10 Regional Educational Laboratories established and funded by ED's Institute of Education Sciences, also has produced an Education Logic Model Application that can be used to build logic models. The Education Logic Model Application is available at: http://relpacific.mcrel.org/ELM.html.

G. Outcomes and Interim Indicators

G-1. Do applicants have to propose the education- and employment-related outcomes and interim indicators that are listed as examples in the NIA?

No. While Application Requirement (f)(2) requires applicants to propose at least one outcome measure in the domain of education and at least one in the domain of employment, the education- and employment-related outcomes and interim indicators listed in the NIA are examples for applicants to consider while developing their proposals. Applicants are not required to use these specific outcomes and interim indicators. The specific outcomes and interim indicators that applicants select should be grounded in their logic model/theory of action, and informed by program results or research, as appropriate. Following are additional examples of measures that may be appropriate for use in the pilot. As with the examples in the NIA, use of these measures is not required.

Employment and Training

Examples of measures for adult employment and training programs are entered employment rate (such as the percentage of participants who are employed in the quarter after leaving a program), employment retention (such as the percentage of participants who are employed six months later), and earnings (such as quarterly earnings in the two quarters after entering employment).

For example, common performance measures used for youth employment and training programs for the Workforce Investment Act Youth Program are placement in employment or education (such as the percentage of youth who entered employment, including the military, or enrolled in postsecondary education and/or advanced training/occupational skills training in the quarter after leaving the program), attainment of a degree or certificate (such as the percentage of youth participants who attain a diploma, GED, or certificate by the end of the third quarter after leaving the program), and literacy and numeracy gains (such as the percentage of youth participants who advance one or more educational functioning levels). These three measures are the Workforce Investment Act's common performance measures for youth.[2]

Note: President Obama signed the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA) (Public Law 113-128) into law on July 22, 2014. WIOA replaces the Workforce Investment Act of 1998, and changes, among other things, the performance measures for employment and training programs. Under WIOA, the primary indicators of performance for youth will include: the percentage of program participants who are in education or training activities, or in unsubsidized employment, during the second quarter after leaving the program; the percentage of program participants who are in education or training activities, or in unsubsidized employment, during the fourth quarter after leaving the program; the median earnings of program participants who are in unsubsidized employment during the second quarter after leaving the program; the percentage of program participants who obtain a recognized postsecondary credential, or a secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent, during participation in, or within one year after leaving, the program; the percentage of program participants who, during a program

---

[2] See ETA's performance measures Web site at
www.doleta.gov/performance/guidance/tools_commonmeasures.cfm.

year, are in an education or training program that leads to a recognized postsecondary credential or employment and who are achieving measurable skill gains toward such a credential or employment; and the indicators of effectiveness in serving employers.

The recent White House report for the President's job-driven training initiatives, "Ready to Work", also discusses these key measures as part of a job-driven checklist for employment and training programs.[3]

Education

Examples of educational outcomes for all youth, including those who are disconnected from school, include: (1) attainment of a high school diploma; (2) attainment of a credential that is equivalent to a high school diploma; and (3) enrollment in, and completion of, at least some kind of postsecondary educational program leading to a degree or certificate. Each of these has a variety of possible interim indicators (such as school/program attendance or credits earned) as well as non-cognitive measures (such as persistence or time management) that are potential indicators of progress for achieving the key outcomes.

Housing Stability and Other Well-Being Outcomes

Outcomes related to well-being of disconnected youth include stable housing as well as those related to personal, cognitive, and developmental status, such as self-regulation, coping skills, conflict-resolution skills, personal efficacy, ability to plan, and pro-social behavior.[4]

Housing Stability and Homeless Reduction

The United States Interagency Council on Homelessness (USICH) published a report, "Framework to End Youth Homelessness," in February 2013 that identified four core outcomes for youth who are experiencing homelessness: stable housing, permanent connections, education or employment, and social-emotional well-being. The report did not provide interim indicators for these outcomes or the pathways to improving services, but it did include a logic model.[5]

Personal and Developmental Well-Being

Research indicates that major predictors of future youth disconnection include poor grades, poor health (including mental health and severe disability), problem peers, and early parenthood.[6] Tracking interim outcomes related to these risk factors, like pregnancy prevention and improved mental health, could improve an applicant's ability to serve this population. For information on the role of risk assessment in service-planning and achieving short-term and long-term outcomes, see www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/opre/resource/framework-for-advancing-the-well-being-and-self-sufficiency-of-at-risk-youth.

---

[3] See Chapter 2 of this report, available at www.whitehouse.gov/ready-to-work.

[4] See "Community Programs to Promote Youth Development" at http://mnliteracy.org/sites/default/files/youth_development_brief.pdf.

[5] See http://usich.gov/resources/uploads/asset_library/USICH_Youth_Framework__FINAL_02_13_131.pdf

[6] Fernandez, Adrienne; Gabe, Thomas. 2009. Disconnected Youth: A Look at 16- to 24- Year Olds Who are Not Working or in School. Washington, D.C.: Congressional Research Service.
Hair, E.; Moore, K., Ling; T, McPhee-Baker, C.; Brown, B. 2009. Youth who are Disconnected and Those who then Reconnect: Assessing the Influence of Family, Programs, Peers and Communities. Washington D.C., Child Trends.

H. Evidence-Based Interventions

H-1. Do applicants have to use studies from Federal registries of evidence-based interventions, such as the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC), to inform their pilot design?

While applicants are not required to use studies from Federal evaluation clearinghouses, applicants are encouraged to use (and cite) research, such as studies that appear in various Federal evaluation clearinghouses, to inform their pilot design, as relevant. While each Federal Clearinghouse on evidence-based interventions uses somewhat different procedures and criteria in its work, they are similar in that the research studies that they include are summarized, and the strength and rigor of their findings are assessed according to specific guidelines.

Clearinghouses with evidence that is related to potential P3 pilots include:

- **ED's What Works Clearinghouse (WWC):** Evidence on programs, products, practices, and policies in education (ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc).
- **DOL's Clearinghouse for Labor Evaluation and Research (CLEAR):** Evidence on labor-related issues (clear.dol.gov)
- **HHS' Teen Pregnancy Prevention Evidence Review:** Evidence on programs with impacts on teen pregnancies or births, sexually transmitted infections (STIs), or sexual activity (hhs.gov/ash/oah/oah-initiatives/teen_pregnancy/db/tpp-searchable.html).
- **SAMHSA's National Registry of Evidenced-Based Programs and Practices (NREPP):** Evidence on mental health and substance abuse interventions (nrepp.samhsa.gov)
- **HHS' Home Visiting Evidence of Effectiveness:** Evidence on home visiting program models that target families with pregnant women and children from birth to age five (homvee.acf.hhs.gov).
- **DOJ's CrimeSolutions:** Evidence on criminal justice, juvenile justice, and crime victim services, programs, and practices (www.crimesolutions.gov).

Other useful Federal Clearinghouses that include literature summaries, program resources, and promising practices, although they do not rate the quality of the analysis or findings, include:

- Self-Sufficiency Research Clearinghouse: Research on low-income and TANF families (www.opressrc.org).
- Workforce Strategies Solutions: Research on education and training; employment, retention, and advancement; and management and operations (http://strategies.workforce3one.org).

I. Evaluation

I-1. What are the key components of a rigorous evaluation?

Although there are many different types of evaluation, only an impact evaluation can establish whether a program or intervention caused an observed outcome. A randomized controlled trial (RCT), when appropriate, can provide the most rigorous causal evidence.

An RCT research design measures the "impacts" of the intervention or program on individuals or systems. An impact is an estimate of the direction (positive or negative) and magnitude (by how much) of the change in outcomes that can be directly attributed to the intervention.

The key to this design is random assignment. Eligible applicants are randomly assigned, such as by lottery, to the treatment group that receives the services provided by the intervention or to a control group that does not. This approach ensures that the two groups are identical in all respects except that one will participate in the intervention (program services) and the other will not. Therefore, any differences in outcomes between these groups (such as different rates of employment) can be attributed to the intervention.

RCTs are considered the "gold standard" (i.e., the most reliable form) of evaluation because they allow programs to claim, with a certain degree of confidence, that participants have improved their outcomes because of that program. Although RCT studies can require more effort to design and implement, if random assignment is conducted correctly, the results provide clear, rigorous evidence of program effectiveness. Additionally, the results from an RCT evaluation will provide important contributions to the evidence base for the intervention. Results from this evaluation approach are also valuable to stakeholders and scholars in determining whether the expected impacts were realized, and in developing approaches that build on this evidence to refine and expand programs.

Quasi-experimental design (QED) studies are similar in most respects to RCTs except, importantly, they determine the members of a treatment and control group by methods other than random assignment. Typical methods including "matching" a treatment group of service participants to a group of similar individuals who did not participate, using characteristics of the individuals prior to their choice to participate. When RCTs cannot be used, quasi-experimental design (QED) studies can sometimes provide good estimates of impact, though they cannot fully distinguish the effects of the intervention (program services) from differences between the two groups that existed before the intervention began and that: (1) cannot be easily measured or used in matching (e.g., persistence, motivation, grit), and (2) could be related to important outcomes. For this reason, impacts estimated from QED studies have to be treated with some caution.

Implementation studies are important components of rigorous evaluations, no matter the design used. An implementation study illuminates and explains "what is happening and why" in the design, implementation, administration, operation, services, and outcomes of social programs. This type of study can provide context and information that makes evaluation results more useful for improving program implementation. In addition, findings from implementation research can be used to inform future program development or replication.

For further details and guidance on the key components of evaluation, please review "The Evaluation Toolkit for Prospective Workforce Innovation Fund Grantees" available at www.doleta.gov/workforce_innovation/pdf/grantees/FINAL_WIF_EvaluationToolkit_5-12-2014.pdf.

J. Budget

J-1. How should applicants budget for the annual "community-of–practice" meetings that are required of pilot sites?

Applicants' budgets must include funds for their participation in two meetings during the project period. The meetings will take place in Washington, DC, and are expected to last for three days. Applicants should plan to bring at least two project staff and may send up to four. An applicant that proposes to conduct an independent evaluation of its pilot may bring an additional fifth person from the evaluation team. All participant travel, accommodations, and meals should be budgeted using start-up funds.

K. Technical Assistance

K-1. What kind of technical assistance (TA) resources will the Federal government make available to pilot sites?

Based on input from the field about the importance of TA, the Agencies are helping sites meet their needs in a number of ways:

- Start-up grant funding. Applicants may propose to use the start-up grant funding for a variety of purposes, including TA that is specific to the needs of the proposed pilot.

- Other Federal funds blended under P3. Pilot sites may also secure TA using a portion of other Federal funds, beyond the start-up grants, that are blended for P3 purposes.

- Community of practice. All P3 grantees must commit to participating in a community of practice that includes an annual meeting of pilot sites (paid with grant funding that must be reflected in the pilot budget that is submitted as part of the application) and peer-to-peer learning activities. A community of practice is a group of grantees that agrees to interact regularly to solve a persistent problem or improve practice in an area that is important to them and the success of their projects. Establishment of communities of practice under P3 will enable grantees to meet, discuss, and collaborate with each other regarding grantee projects.

- Evaluation. Federal agencies are working to identify resources to support P3 pilots (and their independent evaluators) conducting rigorous impact evaluations. Such support could include workshops on common approaches to conducting such studies or common problems encountered, or site-specific assistance on specific issues that arise.

  - Findyouthinfo.gov. The Agencies will support the community of practice in part by using www.findyouthinfo.gov to organize and disseminate TA tools and resources that have been created and/or identified by the Agencies that would have broad applicability across the P3 pilots. These resources might include links to grantee webinars or transcripts and

recordings from calls with project directors, written guidance to assist pilots in understanding program requirements and relevant laws and regulations, and program announcements and other news. The Agencies also intend to provide guidance on Federal information and privacy laws (such as the Paperwork Reduction Act, the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act, and the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act) and assist grantees in developing model consent forms.

Applicant Guide

The P3 pilot authority and start-up grants will be awarded competitively. The Agencies will select pilots and award grants based on the quality of the applications and the selection criteria and other requirements published in the *Federal Register* notice included in this application package. Applicants may determine the duration of the pilot authority and the grant's project period, provided they do not extend beyond September 30, 2018.

The deadline for submitting an application is XX, XX, XXXX at 4:30:00 PM, Washington, DC time. Applicants are expected to review the *Federal Register* notice inviting applications and the instructions provided in this application package for additional information on meeting this deadline. Written requests for a waiver of the electronic submission requirement must be mailed or faxed to the Department no later XX X, XXXX.

Technical Assistance Workshop for Prospective Applicants

To assist prospective applicants in preparing their applications, and to respond to questions applicants may have about the application process, the agencies will host a technical assistance conference call/webinar session, currently scheduled to occur during the following date and time:

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Application Submission Procedures

The deadline for submission of P3 applications through Grants.gov is <mark>XX, XX XX</mark> at 4:30:00 PM Washington, DC time.

Application Transmittal Instructions

<u>Attention Electronic Applicants:</u> This program **requires** the electronic submission of applications--specific requirements and instructions can be found in the Federal Register notice. Please note that you **must** follow the Application Procedures as described in the Federal Register notice announcing the grant competition.

We will reject your application if you submit it in paper format unless, as described in the Federal Register notice for this competition, you qualify for one of the exceptions to the electronic submission requirement and submit, no later than two weeks before the application deadline date, a written statement to the Department that you qualify for one of these exceptions.

<u>Applications Submitted Electronically</u>
Applications for grants under this program must be submitted electronically using the Governmentwide Grants.gov Apply site at <u>http://www.Grants.gov</u>. Through this site, you will be able to download a copy of the application package, complete it offline, and then upload and submit your application. You may **not** e-mail an electronic copy of a grant application to us.

Your application must be fully uploaded and submitted and must be date and time stamped by the Grants.gov system **no later than 4:30:00 p.m., Washington, DC time, on the application deadline date.** Except as otherwise noted in Federal Register notice for this competition, we will not consider your application if it is date and time stamped by the Grants.gov system later than 4:30:00 p.m., Washington, DC time, on the application deadline date.

You should review and follow the Education Submission Procedures for submitting an application through Grants.gov that are included in this application package to ensure that you submit your application in a timely manner to the Grants.gov system.

Please note the following:
- You must attach any narrative sections of your application as files in a **.pdf** (Portable Document) format. **If you upload a file type other than a .pdf file, or submit a password-protected file, we will not review that material**.

- Grants.gov cannot process an application that includes two or more files that have the same name within a grant submission.

- When attaching files, applicants should limit the size of their file names. Lengthy file names could result in difficulties with opening and processing your application. We recommend your file names be less than 50 characters. The amount of time it can take to upload an

application will vary depending on a variety of factors, including the size of the application and the speed of your Internet connection. Therefore, we strongly recommend that you do not wait until the application deadline date to begin the submission process through Grants.gov.

- Your electronic application must comply with any page-limit requirements described in this application package.

- If you are experiencing problems submitting your application through Grants.gov, please contact the Grants.gov Support Desk, toll free, at 1-800-518-4726. You must obtain a Grants.gov Support Desk Case Number and must keep a record of it.

According to the instructions found in the Federal Register notice, <u>only those requesting and qualifying</u> for an Exception to the electronic submission requirement may submit an application via mail, commercial carrier or by hand delivery.

<u>Submission of Paper Applications by Mail</u>:
If you qualify for an exception to the electronic submission requirement, you may mail (through the U.S. Postal Service or a commercial carrier) your application to the Department. You must mail the original and two copies of your application, on or before the application deadline date, to the Department at the following address:

> U.S. Department of Education
> Application Control Center
> Attention: CFDA Number 84.420
> LBJ Basement Level 1
> 400 Maryland Avenue, SW.
> Washington, DC 20202-4260

You must show proof of mailing consisting of one of the following:
(1) A legibly dated U.S. Postal Service postmark.
(2) A legible mail receipt with the date of mailing stamped by the U.S. Postal Service.
(3) A dated shipping label, invoice, or receipt from a commercial carrier.
(4) Any other proof of mailing acceptable to the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Education.

If you mail your application through the U.S. Postal Service, we do not accept either of the following as proof of mailing:
(1) A private metered postmark.
(2) A mail receipt that is not dated by the U.S. Postal Service.
If your application is postmarked after the application deadline date, we will not consider your application.

<u>Note</u>: The U.S. Postal Service does not uniformly provide a dated postmark. Before relying on this method, you should check with your local post office.

<u>Submission of Paper Applications by Hand Delivery</u>:
If you qualify for an exception to the electronic submission requirement, you (or a courier

service) may deliver your paper application to the Department by hand. You must deliver the original and two copies of your application by hand, on or before the application deadline date, to the Department at the following address:

> U.S. Department of Education
> Application Control Center
> Attention: CFDA Number 84.420
> 550 12th Street, SW.
> Washington, DC 20202-4260

The Application Control Center accepts hand deliveries daily between 8:00 a.m. and 4:30:00 p.m., Washington, DC time, except Saturdays, Sundays, and Federal holidays.

<u>Note for Mail or Hand Delivery of Paper Applications</u>:
If you mail or hand deliver your application to the Department--
(1) You must indicate on the envelope and--if not provided by the Department--in Item 11 of the SF 424 the CFDA number, including suffix letter, if any, of the competition under which you are submitting your application; and
(2) The Application Control Center will mail to you a notification of receipt of your grant application. If you do not receive this notification within 15 business days from the application deadline date, you should call the U.S. Department of Education Application Control Center at (202) 245-6288.

Submitting Applications with Adobe Reader Software

The Department of Education, working with Grants.gov, is currently moving from using PureEdge software to using Adobe Reader software exclusively and applications submitted to Grants.gov for the Department will be posted using Adobe forms. Applicants will no longer need to use the PureEdge software to create or submit an application.

Please note: The compatible version of Adobe Reader is **<u>required</u>** for viewing, editing and submitting a complete grant application package for the Department through Grants.gov. Applicants should confirm the compatibility of their Adobe Reader version **<u>before</u>** downloading the application. To ensure applicants have a version of Adobe Reader on their computer that is compatible with Grants.gov, applicants are encouraged to use the test package provided by Grants.gov that can be accessed at
http://www.grants.gov/web/grants/support/technical-support/troubleshooting/verifying-adobe-reader.html# .

Important issues to consider:

- If the applicant opened or edited the application package with any software other than the compatible version of Adobe Reader, the application package may contain errors that will be transferred to the new package even if you later download the compatible Adobe Reader version.

- Applicants **cannot** copy and paste data from a package initially opened or edited with an incompatible version of Adobe Reader and will need to download an **entirely new package** using the compatible version of Adobe Reader.

- Some applicants using an incompatible version of Adobe Reader **may have trouble** opening and viewing the application package while others may find they can open, view and complete the application package but **may not be able to submit** the application package through Grants.gov.

- Grants.gov **does not** guarantee to support versions of Adobe Reader that are not compatible with Grants.gov.

- Any and all edits made to the Adobe Reader application package **must** be made with the compatible version of Adobe Reader.

For your convenience, the latest version of Adobe Reader is available for free download at http://www.grants.gov/web/grants/support/technical-support/software/adobe-reader-compatibility.html.

We strongly recommend that you review the information on computer and operating system compatibility with Adobe available at http://www.grants.gov/web/grants/support/technical-support/software/adobe-reader-compatibility.html **before** downloading, completing or submitting your application.

Applicants are reminded that they should submit their application a day or two in advance of the closing date as detailed in the Federal Register Notice. If you have any questions regarding this

matter please email the Grants.gov Contact Center at support@grants.gov or call 1-800-518-4726

Grants.gov Submission Procedures and Tips for Applicants

To facilitate your use of Grants.gov, this document includes important submission procedures you need to be aware of to ensure your application is received in a timely manner and accepted by the Department.

ATTENTION – Adobe Forms and PDF Files Required
Applications submitted to Grants.gov for the Department will be posted using Adobe forms. Therefore, applicants will need to download the latest version of Adobe reader (at least Adobe Reader 10.1.14). Information on computer and operating system compatibility with Adobe and links to download the latest version is available on Grants.gov at this link: compatibility table. We strongly recommend that you review these details on www.Grants.gov before completing and submitting your application. In addition, applicants should submit their application a day or two in advance of the closing date as detailed below. Also, applicants are required to upload their attachments in .pdf format only. (See details below under "Attaching Files – Additional Tips.") If you have any questions regarding this matter please email the Grants.gov Contact Center at support@grants.gov or call 1-800-518-4726.

1) **REGISTER EARLY** – Grants.gov registration involves many steps including registration on SAM (www.sam.gov) which may take approximately one week to complete, but could take upwards of several weeks to complete, depending upon the completeness and accuracy of the data entered into the SAM database by an applicant. You may begin working on your application while completing the registration process, but you cannot submit an application until all of the Registration steps are complete. Please note that once your SAM registration is active, it will take 24-48 hours for the information to be available in Grants.gov, and before you can submit an application through Grants.gov. For detailed information on the Registration Steps, please go to: http://www.grants.gov/web/grants/register.html [Note: Your organization will need to update its SAM registration annually (formerly Central Contractor Registry (CCR)*.]

   Primary information about SAM is available at www.sam.gov . However, to further assist you with obtaining and registering your DUNS number and TIN in SAM or updating your existing SAM account, the Department has prepared a SAM.gov Tip Sheet which you can find at: http://www2.ed.gov/fund/grant/apply/sam-faqs.html

2) **SUBMIT EARLY** – **We strongly recommend that you do not wait until the last day to submit your application. Grants.gov will put a date/time stamp on your application and then process it after it is fully uploaded.** The time it takes to upload an application will vary depending on a number of factors including the size of the application and the speed of your Internet connection, and the time it takes Grants.gov to process the application will vary as well. If Grants.gov rejects your application (see step three below), you will need to resubmit successfully to Grants.gov before 4:30:00 p.m. Washington, DC time on the deadline date.

Note: To submit successfully, you must provide the DUNS number on your application that was used when you registered as an Authorized Organization Representative (AOR) on Grants.gov. This DUNS number is typically the same number used when your organization registered with the SAM (formerly CCR -Central Contractor Registry). If you do not enter the same DUNS number on your application as the DUNS you registered with, Grants.gov will reject your application.

3) **VERIFY SUBMISSION IS OK** – You will want to verify that Grants.gov received your application submission on time and that it was validated successfully. To see the date/time your application was received, login to Grants.gov and click on the Track My Application link. For a successful submission, the date/time received should be earlier than 4:30:00 p.m. Washington, DC time, on the deadline date, AND the application status should be: Validated, Received by Agency, or Agency Tracking Number Assigned. Once the Department receives your application from Grants.gov, an Agency Tracking Number (PR/award number) will be assigned to your application and will be available for viewing on Grants.gov's Track My Application link.

    If the date/time received is later than 4:30:00 p.m. Washington, D.C. time, on the deadline date, your application is late. If your application has a status of "Received" it is still awaiting validation by Grants.gov. Once validation is complete, the status will either change to "Validated" or "Rejected with Errors." If the status is "Rejected with Errors," your application has not been received successfully. Some of the reasons Grants.gov may reject an application can be found on the Grants.gov site: http://www.grants.gov/web/grants/applicants/applicant-faqs/tracking-an-application.html.

    For more detailed information on troubleshooting Adobe errors, you can review the Adobe Reader Error Messages document at http://www.grants.gov/web/grants/support/technical-support/troubleshooting/encountering-error-messages.html. If you discover your application is late or has been rejected, please see the instructions below. Note: You will receive a series of confirmations both online and via e-mail about the status of your application. Please do not rely solely on e-mail to confirm whether your application has been received timely and validated successfully.

Submission Problems – What should you do?

If you have problems submitting to Grants.gov before the closing date, please contact Grants.gov Customer Support at 1-800-518-4726 or http://www.grants.gov/web/grants/about/contact-us.html, or access the Grants.gov Self-Service web portal at: https://grants-portal.psc.gov/Welcome.aspx?pt=Grants

If electronic submission is optional and you have problems that you are unable to resolve before the deadline date and time for electronic applications, please follow the transmittal instructions for hard copy applications in the Federal Register notice and get a hard copy application postmarked by midnight on the deadline date.

If electronic submission is <u>required</u>, you must submit an electronic application before 4:30:00 p.m., unless you follow the procedures in the Federal Register notice and qualify for one of the exceptions to the electronic submission requirement <u>and</u> submit, no later than two weeks before the application deadline date, a written statement to the Department that you qualify for one of these exceptions. (See the Federal Register notice for detailed instructions.)

Helpful Hints When Working with Grants.gov

Please note, once you download an application from Grants.gov, you will be working offline and saving data on your computer. Please be sure to note where you are saving the Grants.gov file on your computer. You will need to logon to Grants.gov to upload and submit the application. **You must provide the DUNS number on your application that was used when you registered as an Authorized Organization Representative (AOR) on Grants.gov.**

Please go to http://www.grants.gov/web/grants/about/contact-us.html for help with Grants.gov. For additional tips related to submitting grant applications, please refer to the Grants.gov Submit Application FAQs found on the Grants.gov http://www.grants.gov/web/grants/applicants/applicant-resources.html.

Dial-Up Internet Connections

When using a dial up connection to upload and submit your application, it can take significantly longer than when you are connected to the Internet with a high-speed connection, e.g. cable modem/DSL/T1. While times will vary depending upon the size of your application, it can take a few minutes to a few hours to complete your grant submission using a dial up connection. **If you do not have access to a high-speed connection and electronic submission is required, you may want to consider following the instructions in the Federal Register notice to obtain an exception to the electronic submission requirement no later than two weeks before the application deadline date.** (See the Federal Register notice for detailed instructions.)

MAC Users

For MAC compatibility information, review the Operating System Platform Compatibility Table at the following Grants.gov link: http://www.grants.gov/web/grants/support/technical-support/recommended-software.html. **If electronic submission is required and you are concerned about your ability to submit electronically as a non-windows user, please follow instructions in the Federal Register notice to obtain an exception to the electronic submission requirement no later than two weeks before the application deadline date.** (See the Federal Register notice for detailed instructions.)

Attaching Files – Additional Tips

Please note the following tips related to attaching files to your application, especially the requirement that applicants **only include read-only, non-modifiable .PDF files** in their application:

1. Ensure that you attach **.*PDF files only*** for any attachments to your application, and they must be in a **read-only, non-modifiable format**. PDF files are the only Department approved file type accepted as detailed in the Federal Register application notice. Applicants must submit individual .PDF files only when attaching files to their application. Specifically, the Department will not accept any attachments that contain files within a file, such as PDF Portfolio files, or an interactive or fillable .PDF file. Any attachments uploaded that are not .PDF files or are password protected files will not be read. If you need assistance converting your files to a .pdf format, please refer to the following Grants.gov webpage with links to conversion programs under the heading of additional resources: http://www.grants.gov/web/grants/support/technical-support/software/pdf-conversion-software.html

2. Grants.gov cannot process an application that includes two or more files that have the same name within a grant submission. Therefore, each file uploaded to your application package should have a unique file name.

3. When attaching files, applicants should follow the guidelines established by Grants.gov on the size and content of file names. Uploaded files must be less than 50 characters in the file name, contain no spaces, no special characters (example: -, &, *, %, /, #, \) including periods (.), blank spaces and accent marks. Applications submitted that do not comply with the Grants.gov guidelines will be rejected at Grants.gov and not forwarded to the Department.

4. Applicants should limit the size of their file attachments. Documents submitted that contain graphics and/or scanned material often greatly increase the size of the file attachments and can result in difficulties opening the files. For reference, the average discretionary grant application package totals 1 to 2 MB. Therefore, you may want to check the total size of your package before submission.

*Please note that the Central Contractor Registry (CCR) was replaced by the System for Award Management (SAM) effective July 30, 2012.

Application Instructions

Electronic Application Format

Applications for grants under this competition <u>must</u> be submitted electronically, unless you qualify for an exception to the electronic submission requirement in accordance with the instructions in this application package.

<u>In accordance with EDGAR §75.216 (b) and (c), an application will not be evaluated for funding if the applicant does not comply with all of the procedural rules that govern the submission of the application or the application does not contain the information required under the program.</u>

*Important note***:** Applications submitted to Grants.gov for the Department of Education will be posted using Adobe forms. Therefore, applicants will need to download the latest version of Adobe reader (at least Adobe Reader 8.1.2).

Information on computer and operating system compatibility with Adobe and links to download the latest version is available on Grants.gov. Also, please review the **Submitting Applications with Adobe Reader Software** and **Education Submission Procedures and Tips for Applicants** forms found within this package for further information and guidance related to this requirement.

We strongly recommend that you review these details on www.Grants.gov before completing and submitting your application. In addition, applicants should submit their application a day or two in advance of the closing date as detailed below. Applicants will no longer need to use the PureEdge software to create or submit an application. If you have any questions regarding this matter please email the Grants.gov Contact Center at support@grants.gov or call 1-800-518-4726.

Note: Please do not attach any narratives, supporting files, or application components to any forms unless it is specifically required by the instructions for the individual section of the application.

Electronic Application Submission Checklist

It is recommended that your electronic application be organized in the following manner and include the following parts in order to expedite the review process. Instructions for all parts and forms of the application are found either on the following pages of the application package or individually for each form on Grants.gov.

Review your electronic application to ensure you have completed the following forms and sections:

Part 1: Preliminary Documents
❑ Application for Federal Assistance (form SF 424)
❑ ED Supplemental Information for SF 424

Part 2: Budget Information
❑ ED Budget Information Non-Construction Programs (ED Form 524)

Part 3: ED Abstract Form
❑ Project Abstract

Part 4: Project Narrative Attachment Form
❑ Application Narrative

Part 5: Budget Narrative Attachment Form
❑ Budget Narrative

Part 6: Other Attachments Form
❑ Logic Model (required)
❑ Absolute priority (required)
❑ Competitive Preference Priorities 1 and 2 (optional)
❑ Competitive Preference Priority 3 (optional)
❑ Evaluation Commitment Form (required)
❑ Assurance of Partners' Commitment, such as Memorandum of Understanding or Letter of Commitment (required)
❑ Individual Resumes for Project Directors and Key Personnel if already on staff (required)
❑ Letters of Support (optional).

Part 7: Other Assurances and Certifications
❑ Assurances for Non-Construction Programs (SF 424B Form)
❑ Disclosure of Lobbying Activities (Standard Form LLL)
❑ Grants.gov Lobbying Form
❑ General Education Provisions Act (GEPA) Requirements – Section 427 (ED GEPA427 form)

Part 8: Intergovernmental Review (Executive Order 12372)

❑ State Single Point of Contact (SPOC) List

Part 1: Preliminary Documents

❑ Application for Federal Assistance (Form SF 424)
❑ ED Supplemental Information for SF 424

These forms require basic identifying information about the applicant and the application. Please provide all requested applicant information (including name, address, e-mail address and DUNS number).

When applying electronically via Grants.gov, you will need to ensure that the DUNS number you enter on your application is the same as the DUNS number your organization used when it registered with the System for Award Management.

Applicants are advised to complete the Application for Federal Assistance (Form SF 424) <u>first</u>. Grants.gov will automatically insert the correct CFDA and program name automatically wherever needed on other forms.

NOTE: Please do not attach any narratives, supporting files, or application components to the Standard Form (SF 424). Although this form accepts attachments, the Department will only review materials/files attached in accordance with the instructions provided within this application package.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE SF-424

This is a standard form required for use as a cover sheet for submission of pre-applications and applications and related information under discretionary programs. Some of the items are required and some are optional at the discretion of the applicant or the federal agency (agency). Required fields on the form are identified with an asterisk (*) and are also specified as "Required" in the instructions below. In addition to these instructions, applicants must consult agency instructions to determine other specific requirements.

Item	Entry:	Item:	Entry:
1.	**Type of Submission:** (Required) Select one type of submission in accordance with agency instructions. • Pre-application • Application • Changed/Corrected Application – Check if this submission is to change or correct a previously submitted application. Unless requested by the agency, applicants may not use this form to submit changes after the closing date.	10.	**Name Of Federal Agency**: (Required) Enter the name of the federal agency from which assistance is being requested with this application.
2.	**Type of Application**: (Required) Select one type of application in accordance with agency instructions. • New – An application that is being submitted to an agency for the first time. • Continuation - An extension for an additional funding/budget period for a project with a projected completion date. This can include renewals. • Revision - Any change in the federal government's financial obligation or contingent liability from an existing obligation. If a revision, enter the appropriate letter(s). More than one may be selected. If "Other" is selected, please specify in text box provided. A. Increase Award D. Decrease Duration B. Decrease Award E. Other (specify) C. Increase Duration	11.	**Catalog Of Federal Domestic Assistance Number/Title:** Enter the Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance number and title of the program under which assistance is requested, as found in the program announcement, if applicable.
		12.	**Funding Opportunity Number/Title:** (Required) Enter the Funding Opportunity Number (FON) and title of the opportunity under which assistance is requested, as found in the program announcement.
		13.	**Competition Identification Number/Title:** Enter the competition identification number and title of the competition under which assistance is requested, if applicable.
		14.	**Areas Affected By Project:** This data element is intended for use only by programs for which the area(s) affected are likely to be different than the place(s) of performance reported on the SF-424 Project/Performance Site Location(s) Form. Add attachment to enter additional areas, if needed.
3.	**Date Received:** Leave this field blank. This date will be assigned by the Federal agency.	15.	**Descriptive Title of Applicant's Project:** (Required) Enter a brief descriptive title of the project. If appropriate, attach a map showing project location (e.g., construction or real property projects). For pre-applications, attach a summary description of the project.
4.	**Applicant Identifier:** Enter the entity identifier assigned by the Federal agency, if any, or the applicant's control number if applicable.		
5a.	**Federal Entity Identifier**: Enter the number assigned to your organization by the federal agency, if any.	16.	**Congressional Districts Of**: 16a. (Required) Enter the applicant's congressional district. 16b. Enter all district(s) affected by the program or project. Enter in the format: 2 characters state abbreviation – 3 characters district number, e.g., CA-005 for California 5th district, CA-012 for California 12 district, NC-103 for North Carolina's 103 district. If all congressional districts in a state are affected, enter "all" for the district number, e.g., MD-all for all congressional districts in Maryland. If nationwide, i.e. all districts within all states are affected, enter US-all. If the program/project is outside the US, enter 00-000. This optional data element is intended for use only by programs for which the area(s) affected are likely to be different than place(s) of performance reported on the SF-424 Project/Performance Site Location(s) Form. Attach an additional list of program/project congressional districts, if needed.
5b.	**Federal Award Identifier**: For new applications, enter NA. For a continuation or revision to an existing award, enter the previously assigned federal award identifier number. If a changed/corrected application, enter the federal identifier in accordance with agency instructions.		
6.	**Date Received by State:** Leave this field blank. This date will be assigned by the state, if applicable.		
7.	**State Application Identifier:** Leave this field blank. This identifier will be assigned by the state, if applicable.		
8.	**Applicant Information**: Enter the following in accordance with agency instructions:		
	a. Legal Name: (Required) Enter the legal name of applicant that will undertake the assistance activity. This is the organization that has registered with the Central Contractor Registry (CCR). Information on registering with CCR may be obtained by visiting www.Grants.gov.	17.	**Proposed Project Start and End Dates**: (Required) Enter the proposed start date and end date of the project.
	b. Employer/Taxpayer Number (EIN/TIN): (Required) Enter the employer or taxpayer identification number (EIN or TIN) as assigned by the Internal Revenue Service. If your organization is not in the US, enter 44-	18.	**Estimated Funding:** (Required) Enter the amount requested, or to be contributed during the first funding/budget period by each contributor. Value of in-kind contributions should be included on appropriate lines, as applicable. If the

Item	Entry:	Item:	Entry:
	4444444.		action will result in a dollar change to an existing award, indicate only the amount of the change. For decreases, enclose the amounts in parentheses.
	c. Organizational DUNS: (Required) Enter the organization's DUNS or DUNS+4 number received from Dun and Bradstreet. Information on obtaining a DUNS number may be obtained by visiting www.Grants.gov.	19.	**Is Application Subject to Review by State Under Executive Order 12372 Process?** (Required**)** Applicants should contact the State Single Point of Contact (SPOC) for Federal Executive Order 12372 to determine whether the application is subject to the State intergovernmental review process. Select the appropriate box. If "a." is selected, enter the date the application was submitted to the State.
	d. Address: Enter address: Street 1 (Required); city (Required); County/Parish, State (Required if country is US), Province, Country (Required), 9-digit zip/postal code (Required if country US).	20.	**Is the Applicant Delinquent on any Federal Debt?** (Required) Select the appropriate box. This question applies to the applicant organization, not the person who signs as the authorized representative. Categories of federal debt include; but, may not be limited to: delinquent audit disallowances, loans and taxes. If yes, include an explanation in an attachment.
	e. Organizational Unit: Enter the name of the primary organizational unit, department or division that will undertake the assistance activity. **f. Name and contact information of person to be contacted on matters involving this application:** Enter the first and last name (Required); prefix, middle name, suffix, title. Enter organizational affiliation if affiliated with an organization other than that in 7.a. Telephone number and email (Required); fax number.	21.	**Authorized Representative**: To be signed and dated by the authorized representative of the applicant organization. Enter the first and last name (Required); prefix, middle name, suffix. Enter title, telephone number, email (Required); and fax number. A copy of the governing body's authorization for you to sign this application as the official representative must be on file in the applicant's office. (Certain federal agencies may require that this authorization be submitted as part of the application.)
9.	Type of Applicant: (Required) Select up to three applicant type(s) in accordance with agency instructions. A. State Government B. County Government C. City or Township Government D. Special District Government E. Regional Organization F. U.S. Territory or Possession G. Independent School District H. Public/State Controlled Institution of Higher Education I. Indian/Native American Tribal Government (Federally Recognized) J. Indian/Native American Tribal Government (Other than Federally Recognized) K. Indian/Native American Tribally Designated Organization L. Public/Indian Housing Authority M. Nonprofit N. Private Institution of Higher Education O. Individual P. For-Profit Organization (Other than Small Business) Q. Small Business R. Hispanic-serving Institution S. Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) T. Tribally Controlled Colleges and Universities (TCCUs) U. Alaska Native and Native Hawaiian Serving Institutions V. Non-US Entity W. Other (specify)		

[**U.S Department of Education note**: As of spring, 2010, the FON discussed in Block 12 of the instructions can be found via the following URL: http://www.grants.gov/applicants/find_grant_opportunities.jsp.]

Instructions for U.S. Department of Education
Supplemental Information for the SF-424

1. Project Director. Name, address, telephone and fax numbers, and e-mail address of the person to be contacted on matters involving this application. Items marked with an asterisk (*) are mandatory.

2. **Novice Applicant.** Check "Yes" if you meet the definition for novice applicants specified in the regulations in 34 CFR 75.225 and included on the attached page entitled "Definitions for U.S. Department of Education Supplemental Information for the SF-424"). By checking "Yes" the applicant certifies that it meets these novice applicant requirements. Check "No" if you do not meet the definition for novice applicants**.**

This novice applicant information will be used by ED to: 1) determine the amount and type of technical assistance that a novice might need, if funded, and 2) determine novice applicant eligibility in discretionary grant competitions that give special consideration to novice applications. Certain ED discretionary grant programs give special consideration to novice applications, either by establishing a special competition for novice applicants or by giving competitive preference to novice applicants under the procedures in 34 CFR 75.105(c)(2). If special consideration is being given to novice applications under a particular discretionary grant competition, the application notice for the competition published in the Federal Register will specify this information

3. Human Subjects Research. (See I. A. "Definitions" in attached page entitled "Definitions for U.S. Department of Education Supplemental Information for the SF-424.")

3a. If Not Human Subjects Research. Check "**No**" if research activities involving human subjects are not planned at any time during the proposed project period. The remaining parts of Item 3 are then not applicable.

3a. If Human Subjects Research. Check "**Yes**" if research activities involving human subjects are planned at any time during the proposed project period, either at the applicant organization or at any other performance site or collaborating institution. Check "**Yes**" even if the research is exempt from the regulations for the protection of human subjects. (See I. B. "Exemptions" in attached page entitled "Definitions for U.S. Department of Education Supplemental Information for SF-424.")

3b. If Human Subjects Research is Exempt from the Human Subjects Regulations. Check "**Yes**" if all the research activities proposed are designated to be exempt from the regulations. Check the exemption number(s) corresponding to one or more of the six exemption categories listed in I. B. "Exemptions." In addition, follow the instructions in II. A. "Exempt Research Narrative" in the attached page entitled "Definitions for U.S. Department of Education Supplemental Information for the SF-424."

3b. If Human Subjects Research is Not Exempt from Human Subjects Regulations. Check "**No**" if some or all of the planned research activities are covered (not exempt). In addition, follow the instructions in II. B. "Nonexempt Research Narrative" in the attached page entitled "Definitions for U.S. Department of Education Supplemental Information for the SF-424."

3b. Human Subjects Assurance Number. If the applicant has an approved Federal Wide Assurance (FWA) on file with the Office for Human Research Protections (OHRP), U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, that covers the specific activity, insert the number in the space provided. **(A list of current FWAs is available at: http://ohrp.cit.nih.gov/search/asearch.asp#ASUR)** If the applicant does not have an approved assurance on file with OHRP, enter "None." In this case, the applicant, by signature on the SF-424, is declaring that it will comply with 34 CFR 97 and proceed to obtain the human subjects assurance upon request by the designated ED official. If the application is recommended/selected for funding, the designated ED official will request that the applicant obtain the assurance within 30 days after the specific formal request.

3c. If applicable, please attach your "Exempt Research" or "Nonexempt Research" narrative to your submission of the U.S Department of Education Supplemental Information for the SF-424 form as instructed in item II, "Instructions for Exempt and Nonexempt Human Subjects Research Narratives" in the attached page entitled "Definitions for U.S. Department of Education Supplemental Information for the SF-424."

Note about Institutional Review Board Approval. ED does not require certification of Institutional Review Board approval with the application. However, if an application that involves non-exempt human subjects research is recommended/selected for funding, the designated ED official will request that the applicant obtain and send the certification to ED within 30 days after the formal request. **No covered human subjects research can be conducted until the study has ED clearance for protection of human subjects in research.**

Paperwork Burden Statement. According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1894-0007. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average between 15 and 45 minutes per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the estimate(s) or suggestions for improving this form, please write to: U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C. 20202-0170. If you have comments or concerns regarding the status of your individual submission of this form write directly to: (insert program office), U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20202.

Definitions for U.S. Department of Education
Supplemental Information for the SF-424

Definitions:

Novice Applicant (See 34 CFR 75.225)

For discretionary grant programs, novice applicant means any applicant for a grant from ED that—

- Has never received a grant or subgrant under the program from which it seeks funding;

- Has never been a member of a group application, submitted in accordance with 34 CFR 75.127-75.129, that received a grant under the program from which it seeks funding; and

- Has not had an active discretionary grant from the Federal government in the five years before the deadline date for applications under the program. For the purposes of this requirement, a grant is active until the end of the grant's project or funding period, including any extensions of those periods that extend the grantee's authority to obligate funds.

In the case of a group application submitted in accordance with 34 CFR 75.127-75.129, a group includes only parties that meet the requirements listed above.

PROTECTION OF HUMAN SUBJECTS IN RESEARCH

I. Definitions and Exemptions

A. Definitions.

A research activity involves human subjects if the activity is research, as defined in the Department's regulations, and the research activity will involve use of human subjects, as defined in the regulations.

—Research

The ED Regulations for the Protection of Human Subjects, Title 34, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 97, define research as "a systematic investigation, including research development, testing and evaluation, designed to develop or contribute to generalizable knowledge. Activities which meet this definition constitute research whether or not they are conducted or supported under a program that is considered research for other purposes. For example, some demonstration and service programs may include research activities.

—Human Subject

The regulations define human subject as "a living individual about whom an investigator (whether professional or student) conducting research obtains (1) data through intervention or interaction with the individual, or (2) identifiable private information." *(1) If an activity involves obtaining information about a living person by manipulating that person or that person's environment, as might occur when a new instructional technique is tested, or by communicating or interacting with the individual, as occurs with surveys and interviews, the definition of human subject is met. (2) If an activity involves obtaining private information about a living person in such a way that the information can be **directly or indirectly** linked to that individual, the definition of human subject is met* [Private information includes information about behavior that occurs in a context in which an individual can reasonably expect that no observation or recording is taking place, and information which has been provided for specific purposes by an individual and which the individual can reasonably expect will not be made public (for example, a school health record).]

B. Exemptions.

Research activities in which the **only** involvement of human subjects will be in one or more of the following six categories of *exemptions* are not covered by the regulations:

(1) Research conducted in established or commonly accepted educational settings, involving normal educational practices, such as (a) research on regular and special education instructional strategies, or (b) research on the effectiveness of or the comparison among instructional techniques, curricula, or classroom management methods. *If an educational practice is being introduced to the site and is not widely used for similar populations, it is not covered by this exemption*.

(2) Research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures or observation of public behavior, unless: (a) information obtained is recorded in such a manner that human subjects can be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects; and (b) any disclosure of the human subjects' responses outside the research could reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the subjects' financial standing, employability, or reputation. *If the subjects are children, exemption 2 applies only to research involving educational tests and observations of public behavior when the investigator(s) do not participate in the activities being observed.*

Exemption 2 does not apply if children are surveyed or interviewed or if the research involves observation of public behavior and the investigator(s) participate in the activities being observed. [Children are defined as persons who have not attained the legal age for consent to treatments or procedures

involved in the research, under the applicable law or jurisdiction in which the research will be conducted.]

(3) Research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures or observation of public behavior that is not exempt under section (2) above, if the human subjects are elected or appointed public officials or candidates for public office; or federal statute(s) require(s) without exception that the confidentiality of the personally identifiable information will be maintained throughout the research and thereafter.

(4) Research involving the collection or study of existing data, documents, records, pathological specimens, or diagnostic specimens, if these sources are publicly available or if the information is recorded by the investigator in a manner that subjects cannot be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects. *[This exemption applies only to retrospective studies using data collected before the initiation of the research.]*

(5) Research and demonstration projects which are conducted by or subject to the approval of department or agency heads, and which are designed to study, evaluate, or otherwise examine: (a) public benefit or service programs; (b) procedures for obtaining benefits or services under those programs; (c) possible changes in or alternatives to those programs or procedures; or (d) possible changes in methods or levels of payment for benefits or services under those programs. *[The standards of this exemption are rarely met because it was designed to apply only to specific research conducted by HHS at the time the regulations were established. We will strictly construe this exemption because it was not intended to apply to ED research.]*

(6) Taste and food quality evaluation and consumer acceptance studies, (a) if wholesome foods without additives are consumed or (b) if a food is consumed that contains a food ingredient at or below the level and for a use found to be safe, or agricultural chemical or environmental contaminant at or below the level found to be safe, by the Food and Drug Administration or approved by the Environmental Protection Agency or the Food Safety and Inspection Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

II. Instructions for Exempt and Nonexempt Human Subjects Research Narratives

If the applicant marked "Yes" for Item 3.b. of the U.S. Department of Education Supplemental Information for the SF 424, the applicant must attach a human subjects "exempt research" or "nonexempt research" narrative to the U.S. Department of Education Supplemental Information for the SF-424 form. If you have multiple projects and need to provide more than one narrative, be sure to label each set of responses as to the project they address.

A. Exempt Research Narrative.
If you marked "Yes" for item 3.b. and designated exemption numbers(s), attach the "exempt research" narrative to the U.S. Department of Education Supplemental Information for the SF-424. The narrative must contain sufficient information about the involvement of human subjects in the proposed research to allow a determination by ED that the designated exemption(s) are appropriate. The narrative must be succinct.

B. Nonexempt Research Narrative.
If you marked "No" for item 3.b. you must attach the "nonexempt research" narrative to the U.S. Department of Education Supplemental Information for the SF-424. The narrative must address the following seven points. Although no specific page limitation applies to this section of the application, be succinct.

(1) **Human Subjects Involvement and Characteristics**: Provide a detailed description of the proposed involvement of human subjects. Describe the characteristics of the subject population, including their anticipated number, age range, and health status. Identify the criteria for inclusion or exclusion of any subpopulation. Explain the rationale for the involvement of special classes of subjects, such as children, children with disabilities, adults with disabilities, persons with mental disabilities, pregnant women, prisoners, institutionalized individuals, or others who are likely to be vulnerable

(2) **Sources of Materials**: Identify the sources of research material obtained from individually identifiable living human subjects in the form of specimens, records, or data. Indicate whether the material or data will be obtained specifically for research purposes or whether use will be made of existing specimens, records, or data.

(3) **Recruitment and Informed Consent**: Describe plans for the recruitment of subjects and the consent procedures to be followed. Include the circumstances under which consent will be sought and obtained, who will seek it, the nature of the information to be provided to prospective subjects, and the method of documenting consent. State if the Institutional Review Board (IRB) has authorized a modification or waiver of the elements of consent or the requirement for documentation of consent.

(4) **Potential Risks**: Describe potential risks (physical, psychological, social, legal, or other) and assess their likelihood and seriousness. Where appropriate, describe alternative treatments and procedures that might be advantageous to the subjects.

(5) **Protection Against Risk**: Describe the procedures for protecting against or minimizing potential risks, including risks to confidentiality, and assess their likely effectiveness. Where appropriate, discuss provisions for ensuring necessary medical or professional intervention in the event of adverse effects to the subjects. Also, where appropriate, describe the provisions for

monitoring the data collected to ensure the safety of the subjects.

(6) **Importance of the Knowledge to be Gained**: Discuss the importance of the knowledge gained or to be gained as a result of the proposed research. Discuss why the risks to subjects are reasonable in relation to the anticipated benefits to subjects and in relation to the importance of the knowledge that may reasonably be expected to result.

(7) **Collaborating Site(s)**: If research involving human subjects will take place at collaborating site(s) or other performance site(s), name the sites and briefly describe their involvement or role in the research.

Copies of the Department of Education's Regulations for the Protection of Human Subjects, 34 CFR Part 97 and other pertinent materials on the protection of human subjects in research are available from the Office of the Chief Financial Officer, U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C. 20202-4331, telephone: (202) 245-8090, and on the U.S. Department of Education's Protection of Human Subjects in Research Web Site: http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocfo/humansub.html

NOTE: The **State Applicant Identifier** on the SF-424 is for State Use only. Please complete it on the SF-424 in the upper right corner of the form (if applicable).

Part 2: Budget Information

❑ ED Budget Information Non-Construction Programs (ED Form 524)

This part of your application contains information about the ***Federal start-up grant funding*** you are requesting. Remember that you must provide all requested budget information for each year of the project and the total column in order to be considered for Federal funding.

Instructions for completing ED Form 524 Section A:

<u>Name of Institution/Organization</u>: Enter the name of the applicant in the space provided.

<u>Personnel (line 1):</u> Enter project personnel salaries and wages only. Include fees and expenses for consultants on line 6.

<u>Fringe Benefits (line 2):</u> The institution's normal fringe benefits contribution may be charged to the program. Leave this line blank if fringe benefits applicable to direct salaries and wages are treated as part of the indirect cost.

<u>Travel (line 3):</u> Indicate the travel costs of employees and participants only, including travel for 2 representatives to attend the annual community of practice meeting in Washington, DC for each year of the proposed project. *Include travel of persons such as consultants on line 6.*

<u>Equipment (line 4):</u> Indicate the cost of tangible, non-expendable personal property that has a usefulness greater than one year and acquisition costs that are the lesser of the capitalization level established by the applicant entity for financial statement purposes or $5,000 per article. Lower limits may be established to maintain consistency with the applicant's policy.

<u>Supplies (line 5):</u> Show all tangible, expendable personal property. Direct supplies and materials differ from equipment in that they are consumable, expendable, and of a relatively low unit cost. *Supplies purchased with grant funds should directly benefit the grant project and be necessary for achieving the goals of the project.*

<u>Contractual (line 6):</u> The contractual category should include all costs specifically incurred with actions that the applicant takes in conjunction with an established internal procurement system. Include consultant fees, expenses, and travel costs in this category if the consultant's services are obtained through a written binding agreement or contract.

<u>Construction (line 7):</u> Not applicable.

<u>Other (line 8):</u> Indicate all direct costs not covered on lines 1-6. For example, include costs such as space rental, required fees, honoraria and travel (where a contract is not in place for services), training, and communication and printing costs. *Do not include costs that are included in the indirect cost rate.*

<u>Total Direct Costs (line 9):</u> The sum of lines 1-8.

Indirect Costs (line 10): Indicate the applicant's approved indirect cost rate, per sections 75.560 – 75.564 of EDGAR. If an applicant does not have an approved indirect cost rate agreement with a cognizant Federal agency, the applicant must apply to the Department for a temporary indirect cost rate if it wishes to charge indirect costs to the grant. For more information, go to the Department's website at: http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocfo/fipao/icgindex.html.

Note: P3 is not subject to a "supplement-not-supplant" requirement. Unless otherwise noted in a grantee's indirect cost rate agreement, applicants are generally permitted to use the normal "indirect cost rate" rather than the "restricted indirect cost rate" when applying for P3 funds. Grantees who use a restricted rate will recover fewer indirect costs than those who use the unrestricted rate.

Training Stipends (line 11): This line item is not applicable to this program. The training stipend line item only pertains to costs associated with long term training programs and college or university coursework, not workshops or short-term training supported by this program. *Salary stipends paid to personnel for participating in short-term professional development should be reported in Personnel (line 1).*

Total Cost (line 12): This should equal to sum of lines 9-11 (total direct costs + indirect + stipends). The sum for column one, labeled *Project Year 1* (a), should also be equal to item 15a on the application cover sheet (SF Form 424).

Instructions for ED 524

General Instructions

This form is used to apply to individual U.S. Department of Education (ED) discretionary grant programs. Unless directed otherwise, provide the same budget information for each year of the multi-year funding request. Pay attention to applicable program specific instructions, if attached. You may access the Education Department General Administrative Regulations, 34 CFR 74 – 86 and 97-99, on ED's website at: http://www.ed.gov/policy/fund/reg/edgarReg/edgar.html

You must consult with your Business Office prior to submitting this form.

Section A - Budget Summary
U.S. Department of Education Funds

All applicants must complete Section A and provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-11.

Lines 1-11, columns (a)-(e): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Lines 1-11, column (f): Show the multi-year total for each budget category. If funding is requested for only one project year, leave this column blank.

Line 12, columns (a)-(e): Show the total budget request for each project year for which funding is requested.

Line 12, column (f): Show the total amount requested for all project years. If funding is requested for only one year, leave this space blank.

Indirect Cost Information: If you are requesting reimbursement for indirect costs on line 10, this information is to be completed by your Business Office. (1): Indicate whether or not your organization has an Indirect Cost Rate Agreement that was approved by the Federal government.
If you checked "no," ED generally will authorize grantees to use a temporary rate of 10 percent of budgeted salaries and wages subject to the following limitations:
(a) The grantee must submit an indirect cost proposal to its cognizant agency within 90 days after ED issues a grant award notification; and
(b) If after the 90-day period, the grantee has not submitted an indirect cost proposal to its cognizant agency, the grantee may not charge its grant for indirect costs until it has negotiated an indirect cost rate agreement with its cognizant agency.
(2): If you checked "yes" in (1), indicate in (2) the beginning and ending dates covered by the Indirect Cost Rate Agreement. In addition, indicate whether ED, another Federal agency (Other) or State agency issued the approved agreement. If you check "Other," specify the name of the Federal or other agency that issued the approved agreement.
(3): If you are applying for a grant under a Restricted Rate Program (34 CFR 75.563 or 76.563), indicate whether you are using a restricted indirect cost rate that is included on your approved Indirect Cost

Rate Agreement or whether you are using a restricted indirect cost rate that complies with 34 CFR 76.564(c)(2). Note: State or Local government agencies may not use the provision for a restricted indirect cost rate specified in 34 CFR 76.564(c)(2). Check only one response. Leave blank, if this item is not applicable.

Section B - Budget Summary
Non-Federal Funds

If you are required to provide or volunteer to provide cost-sharing or matching funds or other non-Federal resources to the project, these should be shown for each applicable budget category on lines 1-11 of Section B.

Lines 1-11, columns (a)-(e): For each project year, for which matching funds or other contributions are provided, show the total contribution for each applicable budget category.

Lines 1-11, column (f): Show the multi-year total for each budget category. If non-Federal contributions are provided for only one year, leave this column blank.

Line 12, columns (a)-(e): Show the total matching or other contribution for each project year.

Line 12, column (f): Show the total amount to be contributed for all years of the multi-year project. If non-Federal contributions are provided for only one year, leave this space blank.

Section C - Budget Narrative [Attach separate sheet(s)]
Pay attention to applicable program specific instructions,
if attached.

1. Provide an itemized budget breakdown, and justification by project year, for each budget category listed in Sections A and B. For grant projects that will be divided into two or more separately budgeted major activities or sub-projects, show for each budget category of a project year the breakdown of the specific expenses attributable to each sub-project or activity.

2. For non-Federal funds or resources listed in Section B that are used to meet a cost-sharing or matching requirement or provided as a voluntary cost-sharing or matching commitment, you must include:

   a. The specific costs or contributions by budget category;
   b. The source of the costs or contributions; and
   c. In the case of third-party in-kind contributions, a description of how the value was determined for the donated or contributed goods or services.

   [Please review ED's general cost sharing and matching regulations, which include specific limitations, in 34 CFR 74.23, applicable to non-governmental entities, and 80.24, applicable to governments, and the

applicable Office of Management and Budget (OMB) cost principles for your entity type regarding donations, capital assets, depreciation and use allowances. OMB cost principle circulars are available on OMB's website at: http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/circulars/index.html]

3. If applicable to this program, provide the rate and base on which fringe benefits are calculated.

4. If you are requesting reimbursement for indirect costs on line 10, this information is to be completed by your Business Office. Specify the estimated amount of the base to which the indirect cost rate is applied and the total indirect expense. Depending on the grant program to which you are applying and/or your approved Indirect Cost Rate Agreement, some direct cost budget categories in your grant application budget may not be included in the base and multiplied by your indirect cost rate. For example, you must multiply the indirect cost rates of "Training grants" (34 CFR 75.562) and grants under programs with "Supplement not Supplant" requirements ("Restricted Rate" programs) by a "modified total direct cost" (MTDC) base (34 CFR 75.563 or 76.563). Please indicate which costs are included and which costs are excluded from the base to which the indirect cost rate is applied.

   When calculating indirect costs (line 10) for "Training grants" or grants under "Restricted Rate" programs, you must refer to the information and examples on ED's website at: http://www.ed.gov/fund/grant/apply/appforms/appforms.html.

   You may also contact (202) 377-3838 for additional information regarding calculating indirect cost rates or general indirect cost rate information.

5. Provide other explanations or comments you deem necessary.

Paperwork Burden Statement

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1894-0008. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to vary from 13 to 22 hours per response, with an average of 17.5 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data sources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimate(s) or suggestions for improving this form, please write to: U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C. 20202-4537. If you have comments or concerns regarding the status of your individual submission of this form, write directly to (insert program office), U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20202..

Part 3: ED Abstract Form

This section should be attached as a single document to the ED Abstract Form in accordance with the instructions found on Grants.gov and should be organized in the following manner and include the following parts in order to expedite the review process.

Ensure that you only attach the Education approved file types detailed in the Federal Register application notice (read-only, non-modifiable .pdf files). Also, do not upload any password-protected files to your application.

Please note that Grants.gov cannot process an application that includes two or more files that have the same name within a grant submission.

When attaching files, applicants should limit the size of their file names. Lengthy file names could result in difficulties with opening and processing your application. We recommend your file names be less than 50 characters.

❑ **Project Abstract**
 The project abstract should not exceed **two** double spaced pages and should include a concise description of the following information:

- Project objectives and activities;
- Programs proposed for blending;
- Identification of any applicable absolute and competitive preference priorities;
- Proposed project outcomes;
- Names of entities to be included in the partnership;
- Number of participants to be served; and
- Number and location of proposed sites.

Note: Grants.gov may include a note that indicates that the project abstract may not exceed one page; however, an abstract of more than one page may be uploaded.

Part 4: Project Narrative Attachment Form

*This section should be attached as a **single** document to the Project Narrative Attachment Form in accordance with the instructions found on Grants.gov and should be organized in the following manner and include the following parts in order to expedite the review process.*

Ensure that you only attach the Education approved file types detailed in the Federal Register application notice (read-only, non-modifiable .pdf files). Also, do not upload any password-protected files to your application.

When attaching files, applicants should limit the size of their file names. Lengthy file names could result in difficulties with opening and processing your application. We recommend your file names be less than 50 characters.

❑ Table of Contents
The Table of Contents shows where and how the important sections of your proposal are organized.

❑ Application Narrative
The application narrative responds to the application requirements and selection criteria found in this application package and should follow the order of the application requirements and selection criteria.

Applicants are encouraged to limit the narrative section of the application to no more than 40 pages and adhere to the following guidelines:

• A "page" is 8.5" x 11", on one side only, with 1" margins at the top, bottom, and both sides.

• Double space (no more than three lines per vertical inch) all text in the application narrative, including titles, headings, footnotes, quotations, references, and captions, as well as all text in charts, tables, figures, and graphs.

•Use a font that is either 12 point or larger or no smaller than 10 pitch (characters per inch).

•Use one of the following fonts: Times New Roman, Courier, Courier New, or Arial. An application submitted in any other font (including Times Roman or Arial Narrow) will be not accepted.

The recommended page limit does not apply to the cover sheet; eligibility information; the budget section, including the narrative budget justification; the assurances and certifications; or the abstract, the resumes, the bibliography, the logic model, or any letters of support. However, the recommended page limit does apply to all of the application narrative section.

Application Requirements and Selection Criteria for the Program Narrative

Application Requirements

(a) Statement of Need for a Defined Target Population.

(1) The applicant must define the target population to be served, based on data and analysis demonstrating the need for services within the relevant geographic area. The target population must be consistent with the population identified by section 526(a)(2) of the Act.

(2) The applicant's statement of need must include data demonstrating how the target population lags behind other groups in achieving the outcomes that the pilot will seek to attain, including an analysis of disparities in circumstances and outcomes among the target population and these other groups. These data must be based on a needs assessment that was conducted or updated within the past three years using representative data on youth from the jurisdiction(s) proposing the pilot. Applicants do not need to include a copy of the needs assessment with the application, but must identify when the assessment was conducted.

(b) Flexibility, including waivers.

(1) <u>Federal requests for flexibility, including waivers</u>. The applicant must describe the Federal flexibility that is needed to implement the proposed pilot and to improve outcomes for the target population, focusing on changes to major program requirements that would otherwise inhibit implementation. Flexibility involves both the ability to blend funds, thereby aligning certain administrative activities, and other waivers of program requirements. Examples of potential requests for flexibility include, but are not limited to, changes to eligibility requirements, allowable uses of funds, or performance reporting. Applicants must cite the specific Federal statutory, regulatory, or other requirements for which they are requesting flexibility. (More information on flexibility, including waivers, is provided in the FAQ section of the application package).

<u>Note</u>: *The waiver request process for P3, which is part of the application process, differs from standard agency processes. Applicants do not need to submit separate waiver requests or information to the respective agencies outside of the P3 application process.*

(2) <u>Non-Federal flexibility, including waivers</u>. In addition to Federal flexibility, successful implementation of proposals may also depend on flexibility related to requirements imposed at the State, local, or tribal level. The Agencies do not have the authority to waive non-Federal requirements. Applicants therefore must identify the specific State, local, or tribal policies, regulations, or other requirements that may impede the pilot's ability to achieve its goals so that, if the proposed pilot and flexibility, including waivers are approved, requirements across non-Federal levels of government are aligned to support effective implementation. Applicants must provide written assurance that:

(A) The State, local, or tribal government(s) with authority to grant any needed non-Federal flexibility, including waivers, will approve such flexibility within 60 days of an applicant's designation as a pilot finalist; or

(B) Non-Federal flexibility, including waivers, is not needed in order to successfully implement the pilots.

(c) Project Design.

The applicant must present a project design for how it will improve specific outcomes for the target population. The design must indicate the proposed length of the pilot, which may not extend beyond September 30, 2018, and whether and how the applicant intends to incorporate future funding, including FY 2015 funding, into the multi-year project if Congress extends P3 authority.[1] Applicants may propose to expand the number of Federal programs supporting pilot activities using FY 2015 or other future funding beyond the Federal programs proposed using FY 2014 funds. The applicant's design must include the following elements:

(1) An explanation of how the strategies and activities that the pilot will employ are based on (or informed by) available research evidence.[2]

Note: Applicants must cite the studies on service interventions and system reform that informed their pilot design and explain the relevance of the cited evidence to the proposed project.

(2) A description of the Federal program funds the applicant will blend in the pilot to carry out the activities described. In order to qualify for a pilot, the proposal must include at least two Federal programs: (a) that have policy goals related to P3; and (b) at least one of which is administered (in whole or in part) by a State, local, or tribal government (see Appendix B of the notice inviting applications for examples of specific programs that applicants may want to consider). If applicable, the applicant should also describe any Federal funds that will support the proposed pilot or complementary activities by being braided rather than blended, such as funds that are not eligible under the Act to be blended, but may still support relevant activities under the pilot.

Note: Agencies will review the blending of FY 2014 competitive grants in pilots on a case-by-case basis in order to consider how the scope, objectives, and target populations of the existing

---

[1] Authority for pilots to blend funds for future years is subject to Congressional action as well as agency approval. However, because the Agencies will evaluate applications, in part, based on their multi-year plans, an applicant should provide as much information as possible about its future plans. Once pilots are selected, the Agencies may consider changes, including changes in scope and objectives, to pilot designs in subsequent years as a result of new funding streams. The reason for considering those changes is that, because P3 is intended to test a new approach to improving outcomes for disconnected youth, the pilots that demonstrate successful performance and effective governance processes may be able to build on these gains by using additional funding streams and/or including additional partners in future years.

[2] The best evidence for the expected effects of proposed interventions and reforms will be based on one or more studies using a randomized controlled trial. The next best evidence will be studies using a quasi-experimental (matched comparison group). Some studies that use these designs have been reviewed and are available in Federal registries of evidence-based interventions, such as the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) (http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/) and the Clearinghouse on Labor Evaluation and Research (CLEAR) (http://clear.dol.gov/). Correlational analysis may also be used as evidence to support an applicant's proposed reform. More information on Federal registries is provided in the FAQ section of the application package. Applicants are encouraged to identify (and cite) studies that support their proposed pilot strategies and activities (whether from Federal registries or other sources) to explain the strengths and limitations of the existing evidence and to describe how the proposed strategies and activities will take into account those strengths and limitations in the existing evidence. Applicants proposing reforms on which there is not yet research evidence (such as innovations that have not been formally tested or tested only on a small scale) must document how evidence or practice knowledge informed the proposed pilot design.

award align with the proposed pilot. As discussed under the selection criteria, applicants will be scored, in part, based on the extent to which they demonstrate that alignment.

(d) Work Plan and Project Management.

The applicant must provide a detailed work plan that describes how the proposed work will be accomplished. The applicant must describe the professional qualifications that will be required of the project manager and other key personnel to ensure proper management of pilot activities.

(e) Partnership Capacity and Management.

The applicant must--

(1) Identify the proposed partners, including any and all State, local, and tribal entities and non-governmental organizations that would be involved in implementation of the pilot. Partnerships that cross programs and funding sources but are under the jurisdiction of a single agency or entity must identify the different sub-organizational units involved. (2) Provide assurance of the proposed partners' commitment, such as a memorandum of understanding (MOU) or letter of commitment. The assurance of commitment must be signed by the executive leader or other accountable senior representative of each relevant organization or agency and include, at a minimum: (a) a description of each proposed partner's commitment of financial or in-kind resources (if any); (b) how each proposed partner's existing vision and current and proposed activities align with those of the proposed pilot; and (c) how each proposed partner will be held accountable under the proposed governance structure.

(2) Describe how the applicant and proposed partners will use and coordinate resources in order to improve outcomes for disconnected youth. This description may include whether proposed efforts are aligned with, or whether the applicants' and proposed partners' jurisdiction is participating in, complementary Administration initiatives or efforts, such as Promise Zones and Pay for Success, or efforts that are focused on populations such as foster youth, young men of color, or homeless youth. For projects that include a focus on placing youth in work-based training and employment opportunities, applicants should address engagement with business and industry in identifying employment opportunities and skills, defining competencies, designing programs, and developing curricula, when applicable.

<u>Note</u>: *While applicants must describe how the proposed project will use and coordinate resources, participation in complementary initiatives or efforts of the Administration is not a requirement for participation in P3.*

(f) Data and Evaluation Capacity.

(1) Applicants must describe the proposed partnership's data and evaluation capacity, including its ability to collect, analyze, and use data for decision-making, learning, continuous improvement, and accountability. Specifically, the applicant must describe the extent to which the proposed partners have done, and will continue to do, the following:

(A) Manage and maintain computerized administrative data systems to track program participants, services, and outcomes;

(B) Execute data-sharing agreements with programs or organizations to share information with program partners and evaluators for case management, performance management, and evaluation purposes, in accordance with Federal, State, and other privacy laws and requirements;

(C) Link or make progress toward linking programmatic data to administrative data from relevant government agencies;

(D) Collect, store, and make data available to program partners, researchers, and evaluators in accordance with Federal, State, and other privacy laws and regulations;

(E) Use data to determine cost-effective strategies for improving outcomes; and

(F) Regularly analyze program data to assess the pilot's progress, identify operational strengths and weaknesses, and determine how implementation could be strengthened to improve outcomes.

(2) The applicant must propose outcome measures and interim indicators to gauge pilot performance. **At least one outcome measure must be in the domain of education, and at least one outcome measure must be in the domain of employment.** Applicants may specify additional employment and education outcome measures, as well as outcome measures in other domains of well-being, such as criminal justice, physical and mental health, and housing. Regardless of the outcome domain, applicants must identify at least one interim indicator for each proposed outcome measure. Examples of education- and employment-related outcome measures and interim indicators include:

- For High School Diploma Attainment: high school enrollment, attendance, and grade promotion;

- For Community College Completion: class attendance, and credit accumulation; and

- For Sustained Employment in Career Field: job placement or acquisition, employment retention, and earnings.

The specific outcome measures and interim indicators the applicant uses should be grounded in its logic model, and informed by applicable program results or research, as appropriate. More information on outcomes and interim indicators is available in the FAQs included in this application package.

(3) For each proposed outcome measure and interim indicator, the applicant must describe:

(A) The methodology and progress milestones (such as monthly, quarterly, annually) that will be used to assess progress;

(B) The sources of data that will be used, and whether the data are subject to audit or other means of validation for accuracy; and

(C) The frequency with which data will be recorded by the pilot and the frequency with which the applicant proposes to report on outcome measures, interim indicators, and project progress milestones to the Federal government.

Note: *Lead Federal agencies will work with selected pilots to finalize the reporting requirements and to determine the frequency of reporting as part of the performance partnership agreement. The lead Federal agency for each pilot reserves the right to negotiate the selected interim indicators, outcome measures and project progress milestones, and add relevant performance measures as part of the performance agreement process.*

(g) Budget and Budget Narrative.

(1) The applicant must identify specific funding levels for the funding sources to be used in the pilot, specifically--

(A) For each Federal program, the amount of funds to be blended and the percentage of total program funding received by the applicant that this amount represents;

(B) The total amount of funds from all Federal programs that would be blended under the pilot;

(C) The source and amount of any non-Federal funds and programs, including funds from State, local, tribal, philanthropic, and other sources, that will be used for the pilot, as well as a description of how those funds and programs will complement Federal funds in the implementation of the proposed strategy and activities; and

(D) The total amount of all funds, Federal and non-Federal, that will be used to support activities related to the pilot.

(2) The applicant must indicate whether in-kind contributions or other braided Federal funds will be used to support the pilot and, if so, identify these contributions.

(3) The applicant must provide a detailed budget and a budget narrative that describe how the pilot will use the requested grant funds, as well as the FY 2014 and FY 2015 Federal program funds that the applicant proposes to blend. The budget must cover all years during which FY 2014 and FY 2015 Federal funds would be used to support the pilot and must include at least the first full year of the pilot. The applicant should request a specific start-up grant amount that is between $400,000 and $700,000 and describe how the pilot will use these start-up funds to support effective implementation, such as planning, governance, technical assistance, site-specific evaluation, capacity-building, and coordination activities. Examples of other uses include supporting the measurement of pilot performance and results, such as modifications to information systems.

Selection Criteria

Eligible applicants may receive up to 100 total points based on the extent to which their applications address these selection criteria. The number of points that may be awarded for each criterion is indicated in parentheses next to the criterion. An applicant's final score will include both points awarded based on selection criteria and also any points awarded for the three competitive preference priorities.

 A. Need for Project (5 points)

In determining the need for the proposed project, we will consider the extent to which the applicant used a comprehensive needs assessment completed within the previous three years that draws on representative data on youth in the jurisdiction(s) to be served by the pilot that are disaggregated according to relevant demographic factors to: (1) show disparities in outcomes among key sub-populations; and (2) identify an appropriate target population of disconnected youth with a high level of need. Examples of relevant demographic factors include race, ethnicity, gender, age, disability status, involvement in systems such as foster care or justice, status as pregnant or parenting, and other key factors selected by the applicant.

B. Need for Requested Flexibility, including Blending of Funds and Other Waivers (10 points)

In determining the need for the requested flexibility, including blending of funds and other waivers, we will consider the following factors--

(1) The extent to which the applicant presents evidence that specific Federal barriers are hindering successful achievement of outcomes for the target population of disconnected youth identified by the applicant and cites the relevant statute(s), regulation(s), and/or administrative requirement(s) for which it is seeking flexibility, including waivers (5 points); and

(2) The extent to which the applicant provides a justification of how requested flexibility, including blending funds and other waivers, will reduce barriers, increase efficiency, support implementation of the pilot, and produce significantly better outcomes for the target population(s) (5 points).

C. Project Design (25 Points)

In determining the strength of the project design, we will consider the following factors--

(1) The extent to which the applicant presents a clear and logical plan that is likely to improve outcomes significantly for the target population, by addressing the gaps and the disparities identified through the needs assessment, including the extent to which--

(a) The inputs and activities shown in the logic model are necessary and sufficient to achieve the project's objectives, and

(b) The assumptions of the logic model are identified and a rationale is provided for them. For example, applicants proposing job training or employment strategies should include data on the demand for particular occupations in the relevant geographic areas (10 points);

(2) The extent to which the applicant demonstrates that the pilot will use evidence-based and evidence-informed interventions, in addition to systems change, as documented by citations to the relevant evidence [3] (5 points);

---

[3] As described in this notice, the best evidence for the expected effects of proposed interventions and reforms will be based on one or more experimental studies using a randomized controlled trial. The next best evidence will be studies using a quasi-experimental (matched comparison group). Studies that use these designs have been reviewed and are available in Federal registries of evidence-based interventions, such as ED's What Works Clearinghouse

Note: *Applicants should cite the studies on service interventions and system reform that informed their pilot design and explain the relevance of the cited evidence to the proposed project in terms of subject matter and evaluation evidence.*

(3) The extent to which the pilot will provide intensive, comprehensive, and sustained service pathways and coordinated approaches that are likely to improve outcomes significantly over the short, medium, and long term by helping individuals progress seamlessly from one educational stepping stone to another, across work-based training and education, or through other relevant programmatic milestones to improve outcomes. For example, a pilot might prevent gaps in service that would jeopardize the achievement of outcomes by creating a seamless progression of services that provide continuous support as needed to the target population (5 points); and

(4) For Federal programs that are proposed to provide funding for pilots, the extent to which the applicant explains how the use of funds for the pilot: (a) will not result in denying or restricting the eligibility of individuals for services that (in whole or in part) are otherwise funded by these programs; and (b) based on the best available information, will not otherwise adversely affect vulnerable populations that are the recipients of those services. If the applicant proposes to include FY 2014 competitive grant funds that have already been awarded, the extent to which the applicant demonstrates that the scope, objectives, and target population(s) of the existing award align with the proposed pilot (see the FAQs included in this application package for more information) (5 points).

D. **Work Plan and Project Management** (10 points)

In determining the strength of the work plan and project management, we will consider the extent to which the applicant presents a strong work plan and project management approach that includes--

(1) A detailed timeline and implementation milestones, including--

(a) A statement of when any necessary preparatory work will be completed, which must be within 180 days of being awarded pilot start-up funding;

(b) The expected start date of a project manager, the expected award dates of contracts and other authorized subawards, and expected dates for establishing agreements among the partners;

(c) The start date of the pilot services, such as participant intake and services;

(WWC) (http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/) and the Clearinghouse on Labor Evaluation and Research (CLEAR) (http://clear.dol.gov/). Correlational analysis may also be used as evidence to support an applicant's proposed reform. More information on Federal registries is provided in the FAQ section of the application package. Applicants are encouraged to identify (and cite) the studies that support their proposed pilot strategies and activities (whether from federal registries or other sources) to explain the strengths and limitations of the studies, and to describe how the proposed strategies and activities will take into account those strengths and limitations in the existing evidence. Applicants proposing reforms on which there are not yet evaluations (such as innovations that have not been formally tested or tested only on a small scale) must document how evidence or practice knowledge "informed" the proposed pilot design.

(d) When the partnership will begin to implement pilot services or changes to administrative systems and policy and which partners are responsible for key tasks;

(e) The number of participants expected to be served under the pilot for each period, such as quarterly or annually (for example, number of participants enrolled, and the number achieving specified education, employment, and other outcomes); and

(f) For an applicant that is proposing an evaluation (as described in competitive preference priorities 1 and 2), when it will begin evaluation activities, including execution of a contract with an independent evaluator.

(2) A description of how the proposed budget and budget narrative align with the work plan, identifying how each implementation milestone will be adequately funded as outlined in the proposed budget;

(3) A description of any existing or anticipated barriers to implementation and how they will be overcome; and

(4) A description of the professional qualifications that will be required of the project manager and other key personnel, including a description of how such qualifications are sufficient to ensure proper management of all grant activities, such as timely reporting and the ability to manage a strategic partnership (10 points).

Note: If the program manager or other key personnel are already on staff, the applicant should provide this person's resume or curriculum vitae and attach to the **Other Attachments Form***.*

E. Partnership Capacity (15 points)

In determining the strength and capacity of the proposed pilot partnership, we will consider the following factors--

(1) The extent to which the applicant demonstrates that it has an effective governance structure in which partners that are necessary to successfully implement the pilot are represented and partners have the necessary authority, resources, expertise, and incentives to achieve the pilot's goals, resolve unforeseen issues, and sustain efforts to the extent possible after the project period ends, including by demonstrating the extent to which, and how, participating partners have successfully collaborated to improve outcomes for disconnected youth in the past. The proposed governance structure should reflect a plan for effective cooperation across levels of government, including a description of the State, local, and tribal roles in the partnership, or across entities within the same level of government, to improve outcomes for disconnected youth, such as through coordinated program delivery, easier program navigation for participants, or identification and resolution of State and local policy barriers (10 points);

(2) The extent to which the applicant demonstrates that its proposal was designed with input from all relevant stakeholders, including disconnected youth and other community partners. Where the project design includes job training strategies, the extent of employer input and engagement in the identification of skills and competencies needed

by employers, the development of the curriculum, and the offering of work-based learning opportunities, including pre-apprenticeship and registered apprenticeship, will be considered (5 points).

F. Data Capacity (30 points)

In determining the strength of the applicant's data capacity, we will consider the following factors--

(1) The extent to which the applicant demonstrates the capacity to collect, analyze, and use data for decision-making, learning, continuous improvement, and accountability, and has a strong plan to bridge the gaps in its ability to do so, including the extent to which the applicant has, and will continue to:

(a) Manage and maintain computerized administrative data systems to track program participants, services, and outcomes;

(b) Execute data-sharing agreements with programs or organizations to share information with program partners and evaluators for case management, performance management, and evaluation purposes in accordance with Federal, State, local, and other privacy laws and requirements;

(c) Use data to determine cost-effective strategies for improving outcomes; and

(d) Regularly analyze program data to assess progress, identify operational strengths and weaknesses and determine how implementation can be strengthened to improve outcomes (5 points).

(2) The strength of the applicant's plan to manage and link data in ways that comply with all relevant Federal, State, and local privacy laws and regulations to ensure the protection of personally identifiable information (5 points).

(3) The extent to which the applicant shows how the outcomes of the proposed pilot will be a significant improvement compared with what might have occurred in its absence, both during the pilot project period and, for longer-term outcomes, beyond the project period (10 points).

(4) The extent to which proposed outcome measures and interim indicators, as well as their measurement methodologies and progress milestones, are appropriate and sufficient to gauge progress toward pilot objectives (5 points).

(5) The extent to which the data sources for the outcome measures and interim indicators will be accessible and independently audited or validated for accuracy (5 points).

G. Budget and Budget Narrative (5 points)

In determining the adequacy of the resources that will be committed to support the project, we will consider the extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the project.

Part 5: Budget Narrative

*This section should be attached as a **single** document to the Budget Narrative Attachment Form in accordance with the instructions found on Grants.gov. It should be organized in the following manner and include the following parts in order to expedite the review process.*

Ensure that you only attach the Education approved file types detailed in the Federal Register application notice (read-only, non-modifiable .pdf files). Also, do not upload any password-protected files to your application.

When attaching files, applicants should limit the size of their file names. Lengthy file names could result in difficulties with opening and processing your application. We recommend your file names be less than 50 characters.

Each application must also provide a Budget Narrative (which serves to meet the requirements of ED Form 524, Section C) for requested Federal funds, as well as the FY 2014 and FY 2015 Federal program funds that the applicant proposes to blend. The Budget Narrative for requested Federal funds should provide a justification of how the money requested for each budget item will be spent.

This section requires an **itemized budget breakdown** for each project year and the **basis for estimating the costs** of personnel salaries, benefits, project staff travel, materials and supplies, consultants and subcontracts, indirect costs and any other projected expenditures. Be sure to complete an itemized budget breakdown and narrative for each year of the proposed project.

The Budget Narrative provides an opportunity for the applicant to identify the nature and amount of the proposed expenditures. The applicant should provide sufficient detail to enable reviewers and project staff to understand how requested funds will be used, how much will be expended, and the relationship between the requested funds and project activities and outcomes.

Important Note
- ●—Applicants are encouraged to review OMB Uniform Guidance Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards codified at 2 CFR 200 in preparing their budget narrative. In particular applicants are encouraged to review the cost principles and the flexibilities provided in sections 200.102 Exceptions, paragraph (d), which notes that OMB will approve new strategies for Federal awards when proposed by Federal awarding agencies in accordance with OMB Memorandum M-13-17. OMB and the Department of Education expect that innovative proposals received in response to this invitation may be strong candidates for such an exception.

- ●—OMB's Uniform Guidance at 2 CFR 200 is a key component of a larger Federal effort to more effectively focus Federal grant resources on improving performance and outcomes while ensuring the financial integrity of taxpayer dollars.
- ●—

Suggested Guidelines for the Budget Narrative

In accordance with 34 CFR 75.232, Department of Education staff perform a cost analysis of the each recommended project to ensure that costs relate to the activities and objectives of the project, are reasonable, allowable and allocable. We may delete or reduce costs from the budget during this review.

To facilitate the review of your Budget Narrative, we encourage each applicant to include the following information for each year of the project:

1. Personnel
- Provide the title and duties of each position to be compensated under this project.
- Provide the salary for each position under this project.
- Provide the amounts of time, such as hours or percentage of time to be expended by each position under this project.
- Explain the importance of each position to the success of the project.
- Provide the basis for cost estimates or computations.

2. Fringe Benefits
- Give the fringe benefit percentages of all personnel included under <u>Personnel</u>.
- Provide the rate and base on which fringe benefits are calculated.

3. Travel
- Explain the purpose of the travel, how it relates to project success, how it aligns with the project goals and objectives and which program participants or staff will participate. Submit an estimate for the number of trips, points of origin and destination, and purpose of travel. Include travel for 2 representatives to attend community of practice meeting in Washington, DC for each year of the proposed project.
- Submit an itemized estimate of transportation and/or subsistence costs for each trip.
- Provide the basis for cost estimates or computations.

4. Equipment
- Indicate the estimated unit cost for each item to be purchased.
- Identify each type of equipment.

- Provide adequate justification of the need for items of equipment to be purchased.
- Explain the purpose of the equipment, and how it relates to project success.
- Provide the basis for cost estimates or computations.

5. Supplies
- Provide an itemized estimate of materials and supplies by nature of expense or general category (e.g., instructional materials, office supplies, etc.).
- Explain the purpose of the supplies and how they relate to project success.
- Provide the basis for cost estimates or computations.

6. Contractual
- Provide the purpose and relation to project success.
- Describe the products to be acquired, and/or the professional services to be provided.
- Provide a brief justification for the use of the contractors selected.
- Identify the name(s) of the contracting party, including consultants, if available.
- Provide the cost per contractor.
- Provide a brief statement that you have followed or will follow the procedures for procurement under 34 CFR Parts 74.40 - 74.48 and Part 80.36.
- Provide the basis for cost estimates or computations.

7. Construction
- Not applicable.

8. Other
- List and identify items by major type or category (e.g., communications, printing, postage, equipment rental, etc.).
- Provide the cost per item (e.g., printing = $500, postage = $750).
- Provide the purpose for the expenditures and relation to project success.
- Provide the basis for cost estimates or computations.

9. Total Direct Costs
- The amount that is the sum of expenditures, per budget category, of lines 1-8.

10. Indirect Costs
- Identify indirect cost rate (if you will charge indirect costs to the grant)
- Provide a copy of the most recent approved indirect cost agreement in the other attachments form section of the application.

11. Training Stipends
- Not Applicable

12. Total Costs
- Sum total of direct costs, indirect costs, and stipends.
- Please provide total costs for each year of the project as well as grand total cost for the entire project (up to 24 months).

Important Information Regarding Indirect Costs

The Department of Education (ED) reimburses grantees for its portion of indirect costs that a grantee incurs on projects funded by the P3 program (CFDA: 84.240). In order to charge indirect costs to this program, a grantee must have a currently approved Indirect Cost Rate (ICR) agreement. The ICR must be negotiated with and approved by the grantee's cognizant agency, i.e., either (1) the federal agency from which it has received the most direct funding, subject to indirect cost support; (2) the federal agency specifically assigned cognizance by the Office of Management and Budget; or (3) the State agency that provides the most subgrant funds to the grantee (if no direct federal awards are received).

Note: Applicants should pay special attention to specific questions on the application budget form (ED 524) about their cognizant agency and the ICR being used in the budget. Applicants should be aware that ED is very often not the cognizant agency for its grantees. Rather, ED accepts the currently approved ICR established by the appropriate cognizant agency.

Applicants who lack an approved ICR are encouraged to have an accountant calculate a proposed ICR using current information in the audited financial statements, actual cost data or the Internal Revenue Service Form 990. Applicants should use this proposed rate in the application materials and indicate the documentation used to calculate the rate. Guidance related to calculating an ICR can be found on ED's website at http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocfo/fipao/icgindex.html

An applicant selected for funding, that does not have a currently approved ICR, must review and follow the final regulations published at 34 CFR 75.560 in the *Federal Register* on December 7, 2007 (72 FR 69145). The rules allow for a temporary ICR of 10 percent of budgeted salaries and wages and require the grantee to submit an ICR proposal within 90 days after issuance of the grant award notification.

Applicants with questions about charging indirect costs on this program should contact the program contact person noted elsewhere in this instructions package.

Part 6: Other Attachment Form

Attach one or more documents to the Other Attachments Form in accordance with the instructions found on Grants.gov. You may provide all of the required information in a single document, or in multiple documents.

Ensure that you only attach the Education approved file types detailed in the Federal Register application notice (read-only, non-modifiable .pdf files). Also, do not upload any password-protected files to your application.

Please note that Grants.gov cannot process an application that includes two or more files that have the same name within a grant submission.

When attaching files, applicants should limit the size of their file names. Lengthy file names could result in difficulties with opening and processing your application. We recommend your file names be less than 50 characters.

❑ **Logic Model (required)**: All applicants must provide a graphic depiction (not longer than one page) of the pilot's logic model that illustrates the underlying theory of how the pilot's strategy will produce intended outcomes.

❑ **Absolute Priority (required)**: All applicants must indicate in their application whether they are applying under absolute priority 1 (Improving Outcomes for Disconnected Youth), absolute priority 2 (Improving Outcomes for Disconnected Youth in Rural Communities), or absolute priority 3 (Improving Outcomes for Disconnected Youth in Tribal Communities).

❑ **Competitive Preference Priorities 1 and 2 (optional)**: Applicants seeking competitive preference priority points under competitive preference priorities 1 or 2 must provide a Summary Evaluation Plan and a Supplementary Evaluation Budget Narrative.

❑ **Competitive Preference Priority 3 (optional)**: Applicants seeking competitive preference priority points under competitive preference priority 3 should submit a letter of support from the lead organization of a designated Promise Zone that describes the contribution of the applicant's proposed activities.

❑ **Evaluation Commitment Form (required)**: Completion of this form is required, as is explained in Appendix A of the notice inviting applications.

❑ **Memorandum of Understanding or Letter of Commitment (required)**: All applicants must provide an assurance of the proposed partners' commitment, such as a memorandum of understanding (MOU) or letter of commitment. Please see Application Requirement (e)(2) for more information about the contents of the MOU or letter of support.

❑ **Individual Resumes for Project Directors and Key Personnel (required)**: Provide brief resumes or job descriptions that describe the qualifications of key personnel if already on staff.

❑ **Letters of Support (optional).**

Logic Model

Provide a graphic depiction (not longer than one page) of the pilot's logic model[4] that illustrates the underlying theory of how the pilot's strategy will produce intended outcomes. More information on logic models is provided in the FAQ section of this application package.

---

[4] "Logic model" (also referred to as theory of action) means a well-specified conceptual framework that identifies key components of the proposed process, product, strategy, or practice (i.e., the active ''ingredients'' that are hypothesized to be critical to achieving the relevant outcomes) and describes the relationships among the key components and outcomes, theoretically and operationally. (34 CFR 77.1(c).)

Absolute Priorities

All applicants must indicate in their application whether they are applying under absolute priority 1 (Improving Outcomes for Disconnected Youth), absolute priority 2 (Improving Outcomes for Disconnected Youth in Rural Communities), or absolute priority 3 (Improving Outcomes for Disconnected Youth in Tribal Communities).

- **Absolute Priority 1 (Improving Outcomes for Disconnected Youth)**: All applicants must indicate in their application that they are applying under Absolute Priority 1.

- **Absolute Priority 2 (Improving Outcomes for Disconnected Youth in Rural Communities)**: An applicant also is eligible for Absolute Priority 2 if it proposes to serve disconnected youth in rural communities only.

  o A rural community is a community that is served only by one or more local educational agencies (LEAs) that are currently eligible under the Small, Rural School Achievement (SRSA) program or the Rural and Low-Income School (RLIS) program authorized under Title VI, Part B of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as amended, or includes only schools designated by the National Center for Education Statistics with a locale code of 42 or 43..

  o Applicants may determine whether a particular LEA is eligible for SRSA or RLIS by referring to information on the following Department Web site: http://www2.ed.gov/programs/reapsrsa/eligible14/index.html. The first tab in the spreadsheets available at this site lists LEAs that are eligible for SRSA; the second tab lists LEAs that are eligible for RLIS. Applicants may determine school locale codes by referring to the following Department Web site: http://nces.ed.gov/ccd/schoolsearch/.

  o To assist us in verifying eligibility, an applicant that applies under absolute priority 2 must include the following information in its application:

    ▪ A list of the communities it proposes to serve; and

    ▪ A list and the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) identification codes of (a) the LEA or LEAs that serve each of the communities it proposes to serve if the applicant qualifies for this priority through the criterion using the Small, Rural School Achievement program or the Rural and Low-Income School program or (b) the school or schools that serve each of the communities it proposes to serve if the applicant

qualifies for this priority through the criterion using school-level NCES locale codes.

- o Note: Involvement in a pilot by an LEA or school is not a requirement to participate in P3.

- **Absolute Priority 3 (Improving Outcomes for Disconnected Youth in Tribal Communities)**: An applicant also is eligible to apply under absolute priority 3 if it will serve disconnected youth in one or more Indian tribes and represents a partnership that includes one or more Indian tribes. .

  - o Applicants applying under absolute priority 3 must indicate clearly in their applications the Indian tribe(s) they propose to serve.

Competitive Preference Priorities 1 (Quasi-Experimental Site-Specific Evaluations) and 2 (Experimental Site-Specific Evaluations)

In order to be awarded any of the additional points available for competitive preference priorities 1 or 2, applicants must attach the following two documents to the "Other Attachments Form" as separate attachments to their applications:

1. A Summary Evaluation Plan that describes how the pilot or a component of the pilot (such as a discrete service-delivery strategy) will be rigorously evaluated. The evaluation plan does not count against the recommended application page limit, but may not exceed 8 pages. Our reviewers will be instructed to read only the first 8 pages of the plan. The plan must include the following:

- A brief description of the research question(s) proposed for study, and an explanation of its/their relevance, including how the proposed evaluation will build on the research evidence base for the project as described in Requirement 4 and how the evaluation findings will be used to improve program implementation.

- A description of the impact-study methodology, including the key outcome measures, the process for forming a comparison or control group, a justification for the target sample size and strategy for achieving it, and the approach to data collection (and sources) that minimizes both cost and potential attrition;

- A proposed evaluation timeline, including dates for submission of required interim and final reports; and

- A plan for selecting and procuring the services of a qualified independent evaluator[5] prior to enrolling participants (or a description of how one was selected if agreements have already been reached). The applicant must describe how it will ensure that the independent evaluator has the capacity and expertise to conduct the evaluation, including estimating the effort for the evaluator including the time, expertise, and analysis needed to successfully complete the proposed evaluation.

2. A supplementary Evaluation Budget Narrative, which is separate from the overall application budget narrative and provides a description of the costs associated with funding the proposed program evaluation component, and an explanation of its funding source—i.e., blended funding, start-up funding, or other funding (such as philanthropic). The budget must include a breakout of costs by evaluation activity (such as data collection and participant follow-up), and the applicant must describe a strategy for refining the budget after the services of an evaluator have

---

[5] Qualified Independent Evaluator: A qualified independent evaluator is one that coordinates with the grantee and the lead Federal agency for the pilot but works independently on the evaluation and has the capacity to carry out the evaluation, including, but not limited to: prior experience conducting evaluations of similar design (such as for random assignment evaluations, the evaluator will have successfully conducted a random assignment evaluation in the past); positive past performance on evaluations of a similar design, as evidenced by past performance reviews submitted from past clients directly to the awardee; lead staff with prior experience carrying out a similar evaluation; lead staff with minimum credential (such as a PhD plus 3 years of experience conducting evaluations of a similar nature, or a Master's degree plus 7 years of experience conducting evaluations of a similar nature); and adequate staff time to work on the evaluation.

been procured. There is no page limit for the Evaluation Budget Narrative. The Applicants must include travel costs for the independent evaluator to attend at least one in-person conference in Washington, DC during the period of evaluation. All costs included in this supplementary budget narrative must be reasonable and appropriate to the project timeline and deliverables.

In designing their evaluations, we encourage eligible applicants to be familiar with the criteria for well-implemented quasi-experimental and experimental studies as described in both the Department of Education's [What Works Clearinghouse Procedures and Standards Handbook](#) and the Department of Labor's [new standards](#) for its Clearinghouse for Labor Evaluation and Research (CLEAR).

The Agencies will review the Summary Evaluation Plans and Evaluation Budget Narrative and provide feedback to applicants that receive competitive preference priority and that are selected as pilot finalists or alternates. After award, these pilots must submit to the lead Federal agency a detailed evaluation plan of no more than 30 pages that relies heavily on the expertise of a qualified independent evaluator. The detailed evaluation plan must address the Agencies' feedback and expand on the Summary Evaluation Plan.

Competitive Preference Priority 3 (Promise Zones)

In order to be awarded the additional points available for Competitive Preference Priority 3, applicants should attach to the "Other Attachments Form" a letter of support from the lead organization of a designated Promise Zone describing the contribution of the applicant's proposed activities.

A list of designated Promise Zones and their lead organizations can be found at http://hud.gov/promisezones.

Evaluation Commitment Form

How to Submit: An authorized executive of the lead applicant and all other partners including State, local, Tribal, and non-governmental organizations that would be involved in the pilot's implementation, must sign this form and submit it as an attachment to the grant application. The form does not count against the recommended application page limit. When attaching this form to your application package, select "Other Attachments Form" to include this material before submitting the application. Remember, you must convert the completed form into a pdf document before attaching it to the Other Attachments Form. The Department only accepts read-only, non-modifiable PDF files as attachments, and we will not review any material submitted in other formats.

<div align="center">

Commitment to Participate in Required Evaluation Activities

</div>

As the lead applicant or a partner proposing to implement a Performance Partnership Pilot through a Federal grant, I/we agree to carry out the following activities, which are considered evaluation requirements applicable to all pilots:

Facilitate Data Collection: I/we understand that the award of this grant requires me/us to facilitate the collection and/or transmission of data for evaluation and performance monitoring purposes to the lead Federal agency and/or its national evaluator in accordance with applicable Federal, State, local, and tribal laws, including privacy laws.

The type of data that will be collected includes, but is not limited to, the following:

- Demographic information, including participants' gender, race, age, school status, and employment status;
- Information on the services that participants receive; and
- Outcome measures and interim outcome indicators, linked at the individual level, which will be used to measure the effects of the pilots.

The lead Federal agency will provide more details to grantees on the data items required for performance and evaluation after grants have been awarded.

Participate in Evaluation: I/we understand that participation and full cooperation in the national evaluation of the Performance Partnership Pilot is a condition of this grant award. I/we understand that the national evaluation will include an implementation systems analysis and, for certain sites as appropriate, may also include an impact evaluation. My/our participation will include facilitating site visits and interviews; collaborating in study procedures, including random assignment, if necessary; and transmitting data that are needed for the evaluation of participants in the study sample, including those who may be in a control group.

Participate in Random Assignment: I/we agree that if our Performance Partnership Pilot or certain activities in the Pilot is selected for an impact evaluation as part of the national

evaluation, it may be necessary to select participants for admission to Performance Partnership Pilot by a random lottery, using procedures established by the evaluator.

Secure Consent: I/we agree to include a consent form for, as appropriate, parents/guardians and students/participants in the application or enrollment packet for all youth in organizations implementing the Performance Partnership Pilot consistent with any Federal, State, local, and tribal laws that apply. The parental/participant consent forms will be collected prior to the acceptance of participants into Performance Partnership Pilot and before sharing data with the evaluator for the purpose of evaluating the Performance Partnership Pilot.

SIGNATURES

Lead Applicant
Print Name _____
Signature _____
Organization _____ Date _____

Partner
Print Name _____
Signature _____
Organization _____ Date _____

Partner
Print Name _____
Signature _____
Organization _____ Date _____

Partner
Print Name _____
Signature _____
Organization _____ Date _____

Partner
Print Name _____
Signature _____
Organization _____ Date _____

Partner
Print Name _____
Signature _____
Organization _____ Date _____

Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) or Letter of Commitment

You must attach to the *Other Attachments* form an MOU or letter of commitment that has been signed by the executive leader or other accountable senior representative of each relevant organization or agency and include, at a minimum:

(a) A description of each proposed partner's commitment of financial or in-kind resources (if any);

(b) How each proposed partner's existing vision and current and proposed activities align with those of the proposed pilot; and

(c) How each proposed partner will be held accountable under the proposed governance structure.

Part 7: Assurances and Certifications

Be certain to complete all required assurances and certifications in Grants.gov, and include all required information in the appropriate place on each form. The assurances and certifications required for this application are:

❑ Assurances for Non-Construction Programs (SF 424B Form)
❑ Disclosure of Lobbying Activities (SF LLL Form) (required only for applicants who lobby)
❑ Certification Regarding Lobbying (ED 80-0013 Form)
❑ General Education Provisions Act (GEPA) Requirements – Section 427

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETION OF SF-LLL, DISCLOSURE OF LOBBYING ACTIVITIES

This disclosure form shall be completed by the reporting entity, whether subawardee or prime Federal recipient, at the initiation or receipt of a covered Federal action, or a material change to a previous filing, pursuant to title 31 U.S.C. section 1352. The filing of a form is required for each payment or agreement to make payment to any lobbying entity for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with a covered Federal action. Complete all items that apply for both the initial filing and material change report. Refer to the implementing guidance published by the Office of Management and Budget for additional information.

1. Identify the type of covered Federal action for which lobbying activity is and/or has been secured to influence the outcome of a covered Federal action.

2. Identify the status of the covered Federal action.

3. Identify the appropriate classification of this report. If this is a follow-up report caused by a material change to the information previously reported, enter the year and quarter in which the change occurred. Enter the date of the last previously submitted report by this reporting entity for this covered Federal action.

4. Enter the full name, address, city, State and zip code of the reporting entity. Include Congressional District, if known. Check the appropriate classification of the reporting entity that designates if it is, or expects to be, a prime or subaward recipient. Identify the tier of the subawardee, e.g., the first subawardee of the prime is the 1st tier. Subawards include but are not limited to subcontracts, subgrants and contract awards under grants.

5. If the organization filing the report in item 4 checks "Subawardee," then enter the full name, address, city, State and zip code of the prime Federal recipient. Include Congressional District, if known.

6. Enter the name of the federal agency making the award or loan commitment. Include at least one organizational level below agency name, if known. For example, Department of Transportation, United States Coast Guard.

7. Enter the Federal program name or description for the covered Federal action (item 1). If known, enter the full Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) number for grants, cooperative agreements, loans, and loan commitments.

8. Enter the most appropriate Federal identifying number available for the Federal action identified in item 1 (e.g., Request for Proposal (RFP) number; Invitations for Bid (IFB) number; grant announcement number; the contract, grant, or loan award number; the application/proposal control number assigned by the Federal agency). Included prefixes, e.g., "RFP-DE-90-001."

9. For a covered Federal action where there has been an award or loan commitment by the Federal agency, enter the Federal amount of the award/loan commitment for the prime entity identified in item 4 or 5.

10. (a) Enter the full name, address, city, State and zip code of the lobbying registrant under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 engaged by the reporting entity identified in item 4 to influence the covered Federal action.

    (b) Enter the full names of the individual(s) performing services, and include full address if different from 10(a). Enter Last Name, First Name, and Middle Initial (MI).

11. The certifying official shall sign and date the form, print his/her name, title, and telephone number.

Instructions for Meeting the General Education Provisions Act (GEPA) Section 427 Requirements

All applicants for new awards **<u>must</u>** include information in their applications to address this provision in order to receive funding under this program.

Section 427 **requires** each applicant for funds (other than an individual person) to include in its application a description of the steps the applicant proposes to take to ensure equitable access to, and participation in, its Federally-assisted program for students, teachers, and other program beneficiaries with special needs.

This provision allows applicants discretion in developing the required description. The statute highlights six types of barriers that can impede equitable access or participation: gender, race, national origin, color, disability, or age.

A general statement of an applicant's nondiscriminatory hiring policy is **<u>not</u>** sufficient to meet this requirement. Applicants must identify potential barriers and explain steps they will take to overcome these barriers.

Applicants are **required** to address this provision by attaching a statement (not to exceed three pages) to the **ED GEPA427 form** that is included in the electronic application package in Grants.gov.

Part 8: Intergovernmental Review of Federal Programs (Executive Order 12372)

This program falls under the rubric of Executive Order 12372 (Intergovernmental Review of Federal Programs) and the regulations in 34 CFR Part 79. One of the objectives of the Executive order is to strengthen federalism--or the distribution of responsibility between localities, States, and the Federal government--by fostering intergovernmental partnerships. This idea includes supporting processes that State or local governments have devised for coordinating and reviewing proposed Federal financial grant applications.

The process for doing this requires grant applicants to contact State Single Points of Contact for information on how this works. Multi-state applicants should follow procedures specific to each state.

Further information about the State Single Point of Contact (SPOC) process and a list of names by State can be found at:

http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/grants_spoc

Absent specific State review programs, applicants may submit comments directly to the Department. All recommendations and comments must be mailed or hand-delivered by the date indicated in the actual application notice to the following address: The Secretary, EO 12372--CFDA# 84.215G, U.S. Department of Education, room 7E200. 400 Maryland Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20202.

Proof of mailing will be determined on the same basis as applications (see 34 CFR §75.102). Recommendations or comments may be hand-delivered until 4:30 p.m. (eastern time) on the closing date indicated in this notice.

Important note: The above address is not the same address as the one to which the applicant submits its completed applications. ***Do not send applications to the above address.***

Not all states have chosen to participate in the intergovernmental review process, and therefore do not have a SPOC. If you are located in a State that does not have a SPOC, you may send application materials directly to the Department as described in the *Federal Register* notice.

Reporting and Accountability

Lead Federal Agencies will work with selected pilots to finalize their reporting requirements and to determine the frequency of reporting as part of the performance partnership agreement. The Department of Education and any other Federal agency designated by OMB as a co-lead for each pilot reserve the right to negotiate the selected interim indicators, measures and progress milestones, and add relevant performance measures as part of the performance agreement process.

Legal and Regulatory Information

Notice Inviting Applications

4000-01-U
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Applications for New Awards; Performance Partnership Pilots
AGENCY: Office of Career, Technical, and Adult Education**,** Department of Education
ACTION: Notice.
Overview Information:
Performance Partnership Pilots
Notice inviting applications for new awards for fiscal year (FY) 2014.
Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) Number: 84.420.
Dates:
Applications Available: [INSERT DATE OF PUBLICATION IN THE FEDERAL REGISTER].
Deadline for Notice of Intent to Apply: [INSERT DATE 45 DAYS AFTER DATE OF PUBLICATION IN THE FEDERAL REGISTER].
Note: Submission of a notice of intent to apply is optional.
Deadline for Transmittal of Applications: [INSERT DATE 100 DAYS AFTER DATE OF PUBLICATION IN THE FEDERAL REGISTER].
Deadline for Intergovernmental Review: [INSERT DATE 160 DAYS AFTER DATE OF PUBLICATION IN THE FEDERAL REGISTER].
Full Text of Announcement
I. Funding Opportunity Description
Purpose of Program: The Performance Partnership Pilots (P3) program, authorized by the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2014, Division H, Section 526 (the Act), will enable up to ten pilot sites to test innovative, outcome-focused strategies to achieve significant improvements in educational, employment, and other key outcomes[1] for disconnected youth[2] using new flexibility to blend[3] existing Federal funds and to seek waivers[4] of associated program requirements. P3 pilots will receive start-up grants to support ongoing planning, streamlined governance,

---

[1] Outcomes are the intended results of a program, or intervention. They are what you expect your project to achieve. An outcome can be at the participant level (for example, changes in employment retention or earnings of disconnected youth) or at the system level (for example, improved efficiency in program operations or administration).

[2] The Act defines "disconnected youth" as individuals between the ages of 14 and 24 who are low-income, and either homeless, in foster care, involved in the juvenile justice system, unemployed, or not enrolled in, or at risk of dropping out of, an educational institution.

[3] Blending funds is a funding and resource allocation strategy that uses multiple existing funding streams to support a single initiative or strategy. Blended funding merges two or more funding streams, or portions of multiple funding streams, to produce greater efficiency and/or effectiveness. Funds from each individual stream lose their award-specific identity, and the blended funds together become subject to a single set of reporting and other requirements, consistent with the underlying purposes of the programs for which the funds were appropriated.

strengthened data infrastructure, improved coordination, and related activities to help pilots improve outcomes for disconnected youth.

Successful pilots will use cost-effective strategies to increase the success of disconnected youth in achieving educational, employment, well-being, and other key outcomes. Through a combination of careful implementation of evidence-based and promising practices, effective administrative structures, alignment of outcomes and performance measures, and more efficient and integrated data systems, P3 may produce better outcomes per dollar by focusing resources on what works, rather than on compliance with multiple Federal program requirements that may not best support outcomes.

Background:

The Act authorizes the Departments of Education (ED), Labor (DOL), and Health and Human Services (HHS), the Corporation for National and Community Service (CNCS) and/or the Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS) (collectively, the Agencies), to enter into a total of up to ten Performance Partnership Agreements (performance agreements) with State, local, or tribal governments[5] to provide additional flexibility in using certain of the Agencies' FY 2014 discretionary funds,[6] including competitive and certain formula grant funds, across multiple Federal programs. Entities that seek to participate in these pilots will have to commit to achieving significant improvements in outcomes for disconnected youth in exchange for this new flexibility. Section 526(a)(2) of the Act states that "'[t]o improve outcomes for disconnected youth' means to increase the rate at which individuals between the ages of 14 and 24 (who are low-income and either homeless, in foster care, involved in the juvenile justice system, unemployed, or not enrolled in or at risk of dropping out of an educational institution) achieve success in meeting educational, employment, or other key goals."

Government and community partners have invested considerable attention and resources to meet the needs of disconnected youth. However, practitioners, youth advocates, and others on the front lines of service delivery have observed that there are significant programmatic and administrative obstacles to achieving meaningful improvements in education, employment, health, and well-being for these young people. These challenges include: limited evidence and knowledge of what works to improve outcomes for disconnected youth; poor coordination and alignment across the multiple systems that serve youth; policies that make it hard to target the neediest youth and help them overcome gaps in services; fragmented data systems that inhibit the flow of information to improve results; and administrative requirements that impede holistic approaches to serving this population. Many of these challenges can be addressed by improving coordination among programs and targeting resources to those approaches that achieve the best results for youth. More information on these challenges, approaches to address challenges, and the consultation that the Agencies have conducted with stakeholders on these issues can be found in the P3 Consultation Paper, "Changing the Odds for Disconnected Youth: Initial Design

---

[4] A waiver provides flexibility around statutory, regulatory, or administrative requirements to enable a State, locality, or tribe to organize its programs and systems or provide services in ways that best meet the needs of its target populations. Under P3, waivers provide flexibility in exchange for a grantee's commitment to improve programmatic outcomes consistent with underlying statutory authorities and purposes.

[5] A tribal government must represent a State- or Federally- recognized tribe to be eligible.

[6] Discretionary funds are funds that Congress appropriates on an annual basis, rather than through a standing authorization. They exclude "entitlement" (or mandatory) programs such as Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, most Foster Care IV-E programs, and Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF). Discretionary programs administered by the Agencies support a broad set of public services, including education, job training, health and mental health, and other low-income assistance programs.

Considerations for Performance Partnership Pilots" (available at www.findyouthinfo.gov/docs/P3_Consultation_Paper_508.pdf).

Performance Partnership Pilots will test the hypothesis that additional flexibility for States, localities, and tribes, in the form of blending funds and obtaining waivers of certain programmatic requirements, can help overcome some of the significant hurdles that States, localities, and tribes may face in providing intensive, comprehensive, and sustained service pathways[7] and improving outcomes for disconnected youth. For example, P3 may help address the "wrong pockets" problem, where programs that see improved outcomes or other benefits due to an intervention are unable to provide funds to support that intervention based on program restrictions. P3 funds may also help to build additional evidence that an intervention is successful or to strengthen a foundation of data capacity and performance management. If this hypothesis proves true, providing necessary and targeted flexibility to remove or overcome these hurdles will help to achieve significant benefits for disconnected youth, the communities that serve them, and the agencies and partners that are involved.

Partnerships are critical to pilots' ability to provide innovative and effective service-delivery and systems-change strategies that meet the education, employment, and other needs of disconnected youth. We encourage applicants to build on strong, existing partnerships that have experience in working together to improve outcomes for disconnected youth. Partnerships will vary depending on the nature and focus of individual projects, but may cut across: State, local, and tribal levels of government; education, employment, and other agencies or programs operating within the same level of government; and governmental, non-profit, and other private-sector organizations. As partnerships work to improve outcomes, meaningful measures and indicators that draw on reliable data will be critical to understanding how well pilots attain their goals. As a result, it is important to make sure that pilots track outcome measures and interim indicators[8] that will accurately capture their performance and success and that the pilots have the capacity to collect, access, and analyze these data as Federal, State, and local laws allow.

For purely illustrative purposes, examples of potential pilots include:

• A State, local or tribal government and its partners could build an integrated enrollment and case-management system that would be used by numerous youth-serving systems (juvenile justice, child welfare, mental health, workforce and vocational rehabilitation systems) in order to better target appropriate services to youth who are served by multiple systems.

• A State, local, or tribal government and its partners could develop and test a coordinated approach to serving youth who are involved in multiple systems that creates joint performance goals, integrates services for vulnerable youth and their families, and aligns conflicting eligibility requirements that currently result in service gaps.

• A State, local, or tribal government and its partners might implement systems change by establishing cross-sector collaboration at the local level to break down municipal agency "silos." This pilot could create integrated teams that represent multiple agencies and service systems to comprehensively address the needs of individual clients and establish new mechanisms for sharing and tracking data across multiple systems that serve disconnected youth in accordance with Federal, State, and local laws. Systems change can include strong partnerships with local philanthropic organizations and non-profit service providers.

---

[7] A service pathway is a series of connected service interventions that aim to change behavior and increase knowledge or skills.

[8] An interim indicator is a marker of achievement that demonstrates progress toward an outcome.

• A State, local, or tribal government could create a more integrated and effective job-driven training and service-delivery system that enhances key elements of programs, such as employer engagement, leveraging of public and private resources, data-informed decision making, work-based training opportunities, career pathways, outcomes measurement and program improvement, and the elimination of barriers to employment to ensure that disconnected youth are equipped with the skills that employers need and are connected to employers with good job opportunities. A job-driven training program that uses the flexibilities offered by P3 might combine Workforce Investment Act youth formula program funding for job training and adult education funds for literacy and numeracy training (and, if Congress continues P3 authority in FY 2015, Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act youth formula program and adult education funding) , and other program funds to eliminate employment barriers.
P3 is one of multiple Federal approaches to advance innovation and program delivery to address critical social challenges through community-driven, evidence-based strategies. Complementary approaches, which are laid out in the P3 Consultation Paper, include:

     • Promise Zones, which ensure that Federal programs and resources are focused intensely on hard-hit communities;

     • Job-Driven Training, which drives improvements in workforce development and job training programs, emphasizing effective approaches that lead to education and credentials needed for in-demand jobs, and providing workers with pathways to good careers and incomes;

     • Federal innovation funds – including the Social Innovation Fund, the Workforce Innovation Fund, and the education-focused Investing in Innovation Fund – which support projects that use and build evidence about how to effectively improve skills of at-risk youth that will enable them to succeed in the workforce; and

     • Pay for Success initiatives launched by the Department of Justice, DOL, and CNCS, which are fostering outcome-focused partnerships among Federal and State governments, local communities, private-sector investors, service providers, and research organizations to implement cost-effective services that improve outcomes for disconnected youth while generating savings for taxpayers.

Key Features of Successful P3 Proposals

     P3 will support a youth-centric approach to service pathways by enabling pilot sites to define the key outcomes that youth in the target population should achieve and to coordinate services so they can achieve those outcomes. Pilots will: (1) identify the pilot's target population through a needs assessment; (2) use data and evaluations to determine the most effective strategies for serving the target population; (3) propose appropriate funding streams to blend in order to support the strategies; (4) identify the flexibility, both Federal and non-Federal, they need in order to implement the strategies; and finally (5) enter into a performance agreement with a lead Federal agency (designated by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB)) and pilot partners (including any and all State, local, and tribal entities that would be involved in implementation of the pilot) that specifies pilot goals, outcome measures and interim indicators, accountability and oversight mechanisms, and responsibilities of the entities involved.

  (1) Identify the pilot's target population through a needs assessment.
     Federal consultation with stakeholders has underscored that unclear, varied, or conflicting eligibility criteria for programs that serve youth have posed a barrier to providing comprehensive, effective services for disconnected youth. The broad statutory definition of "disconnected youth" provided in section 526(a)(2) of the Act, combined with the Agencies' expanded authority to allow pilots to blend funds and obtain other waivers of program

requirements, is meant to address this barrier by providing applicants with flexibility to define a specific sub-population of disconnected youth that the pilot will serve. This target population must be identified through a data-driven needs assessment, which is discussed further in the Application Requirements section of this notice.

   (2) Use data and evaluations to determine the most effective strategies for serving the target population.

The Agencies are seeking to ensure that pilots create a foundation for broader change and continuous improvement in serving disconnected youth. P3 will therefore support pilots that include, to the greatest extent possible, evidence-based and evidence–informed[9] interventions and practices.

In many cases, broader change and continuous improvement rely on both specific service-delivery models and also larger systems, such as policy and administrative frameworks. The Agencies are interested in pilots that draw on the best available evidence about how to improve outcomes for disconnected youth, both generally as well as for applicants' specific target populations, through both service delivery and systems change.

   (3) Propose appropriate funding streams to blend in order to support the strategies.

     P3 allows States, localities, and tribes to blend certain FY 2014 discretionary funds from the Agencies in order to implement outcome-focused strategies for serving disconnected youth. When funds are blended, individual funding streams, or portions of the funding streams, are merged under a single set of reporting and other requirements, losing their award-specific identity. The unified requirements for blended funds may differ from the various requirements that are associated with each of the original, individual funding streams, but must be consistent with the purposes of the programs under which the funds were appropriated. In addition, when activities are supported by blended funding streams, the associated costs do not need to be allocated or tracked back to the original, separate programs.

     Programs from which funds may be blended in pilots are limited to those that target disconnected youth, or that are designed to prevent youth from disconnecting from school or work by providing education, training, employment, and other related social services. More information about programs that applicants may want to consider in their proposals is provided in Appendix B.

     Where funding streams from certain Federal programs are not eligible or suitable for blending under P3, pilots may also consider how to braid[10] them, or align them in other ways that

---

[9] Evidence-based interventions are approaches to prevention or treatment that are validated by documented scientific evidence from experimental, quasi-experimental or correlational studies and that show positive effects on the primary targeted outcomes (for experimental and quasi-experimental studies) or favorable associations (for correlational studies). The best evidence to support an applicant's proposed reform(s) and target population will be based on one or more studies using a randomized controlled trial. The next best evidence will be studies using a quasi-experimental (matched comparison) group. Definitions for these types of studies can be found in 34 CFR 77.1(c). Correlational analysis may also be used as evidence to support an applicant's proposed reforms. Interventions and practices are considered evidence-informed if they bring together the best available research, professional expertise, and input from youth and families to identify and deliver services that have promise to achieve positive outcomes for youth, families, and communities. Applicants proposing reforms on which there are not yet evaluations (such as innovations that have not been formally tested or tested only on a small scale) must document how evidence or practice knowledge informed the proposed pilot design.

[10] Braiding funding is a funding and resource allocation strategy in which entities use existing funding streams to support unified initiatives in as flexible and integrated a manner as possible while still tracking and maintaining separate accountability for each funding stream. One or more entities may coordinate several funding sources, but each individual funding stream maintains its award-specific identity.

promote more effective and efficient outcomes while maintaining the separate identity of each funding stream. Pilots may involve both blended and braided funds.

In general, the pilots are intended to facilitate flexible use of existing funding streams that were made available under the Act. However, in order to provide incentives to participate in P3 and facilitate the initial implementation of performance agreements that will likely require additional coordination and collaboration among a range of State, local, and tribal agencies, the Agencies are awarding FY 2014 start-up funding in this competition. These start-up grants will be in the range of $400,000 - $700,000 per grantee.

(4) Identify the flexibilities, both Federal and non-Federal, pilots need in order to implement the strategies.

P3 authority enables heads of the Agencies to approve significant flexibilities, including both the authority to permit blending of funds and the authority to grant waivers of program requirements associated with these funds. In addition to any existing waiver authority that the Agencies have, they also may waive any statutory, regulatory, or administrative requirements that they are otherwise not authorized to waive, as long as the waiver is in keeping with important safeguards (see sections 526(d) and (f) of the Act). Specifically, the waivers must be consistent with the statutory purposes of the relevant Federal programs necessary to achieve the pilot's outcomes, and no broader in scope than necessary to achieve those outcomes. Requirements related to nondiscrimination, wage and labor standards, and the allocation of funds to State and sub-State levels cannot be waived. Agency heads also must determine that the Agency's participation and the use of proposed program funds: (1) will not result in denying or restricting individual eligibility for services funded by those programs; and (2) will not adversely affect vulnerable populations that are the recipients of those services.

The flexibility, including waivers, permitted under the Act will allow pilot sites to tailor requirements, such as the allowable activities, eligibility criteria and reporting requirements for Federal funds, so that they support the goals and objectives of the pilot and maximize its capacity to improve outcomes for youth.

Successful applicants will be responsible for identifying and securing flexibilities that they need at the State, local, or tribal level in order to implement their pilots.

(5) Enter into a performance agreement with a lead Federal agency (designated by OMB) and pilot partners.

The Act requires that each selected pilot be governed by a performance agreement between a lead Federal agency and the respective representatives of all of the State, local, or tribal governments participating in the agreement (see program requirement (d)). Performance agreements will identify, among other things, the Federal funds and programs involved in the pilot, the population to be served and the outcome(s) to be achieved by the pilot, and the cost-effective Federal oversight procedures that will be used for the purpose of maintaining the necessary level of accountability for funds. OMB has designated ED as the lead agency for purposes of administering P3 start-up grants. OMB may also designate an additional lead Federal agency for each pilot on the basis of the programs included and/or the outcomes sought in the pilot.

Priorities: The Agencies are establishing these priorities for the FY 2014 grant competition and any subsequent year for which P3 awards are made from the list of unfunded applicants from this competition. We are establishing absolute priorities 1 through 3 and competitive preference priorities 1 and 2 in accordance with section 437(d)(1) of the General Education Provisions Act

(GEPA), 20 U.S.C. 1232(d)(1). Competitive preference priority 3 is from the notice of final priority--Promise Zones, published in the <u>Federal Register</u> on March 27, 2014 (79 FR 17035). <u>Absolute Priorities</u>: For FY 2014 and any subsequent year for which we make awards from the list of unfunded applicants from this competition, these priorities are absolute priorities. Under 34 CFR 75.105(c)(3) we consider only applications that meet Absolute Priority 1, 2, or 3. <u>Note</u>: Applicants must indicate in their application whether they are applying under absolute priority 1, absolute priority 2, or absolute priority 3. An applicant that applies under absolute priority 2, but is not eligible for funding under absolute priority 2, or applies under absolute priority 3, but is not eligible for funding under absolute priority 3, may be considered for funding under absolute priority 1.

Because a diverse group of communities could benefit from P3, the Secretary establishes an absolute priority for applications that propose to serve disconnected youth in one or more rural communities only[11], and an absolute priority for applications that propose to serve disconnected youth in one or more Indian tribes, and an absolute priority for applications that propose to serve disconnected youth in other communities. P3 is intended, through a demonstration, to identify effective strategies for serving disconnected youth. The Agencies are aware such strategies may differ across environments, and wish to test the authority in a variety of settings. Stakeholder input emphasized that tribal and rural communities in particular can face unique challenges in effectively serving disconnected youth.

These priorities are:

<u>Absolute Priority 1 -- Improving Outcomes for Disconnected Youth</u>.

Under this priority, we provide funding to an applicant that proposes a pilot designed to improve outcomes for disconnected youth.

<u>Absolute Priority 2 -- Improving Outcomes for Disconnected Youth in Rural Communities</u>.

Under this priority, we provide funding to an applicant that (1) meets absolute priority 1; and (2) proposes to serve disconnected youth in one or more rural communities only.

Note: To assist us in verifying whether an applicant qualifies for absolute priority 2, an applicant that applies under absolute priority 2 must include the following information in its application: (1) a list of the communities it proposes to serve; and (2) a list and the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) identification codes of (a) the LEA or LEAs that serve each of the communities it proposes to serve if the applicant qualifies for this priority through the criterion using the Small, Rural School Achievement program or the Rural and Low-Income School program or (b) the school or schools that serve each of the communities it proposes to serve if the applicant qualifies for this priority through the criterion using school-level NCES locale codes.

<u>Absolute Priority 3 -- Improving Outcomes for Disconnected Youth in Tribal Communities</u>.

---

[11] A rural community is a community that is served only by one or more local educational agencies (LEAs) that are currently eligible under the Small, Rural School Achievement (SRSA) program or the Rural and Low-Income School (RLIS) program authorized under Title VI, Part B of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as amended, or includes only schools designated by the National Center for Education Statistics with a locale code of 42 or 43. Applicants may determine whether a particular LEA is eligible for the SRSA or RLIS programs by referring to information on the following Department Web site: http://www2.ed.gov/programs/reapsrsa/eligible14/index.html. The first tab in the spreadsheets available at this site lists LEAs that are eligible for SRSA; the second tab lists LEAs that are eligible for RLIS. Applicants may determine school locale codes by referring to the following Department Web site: http://nces.ed.gov/ccd/schoolsearch/. Involvement in a pilot by an LEA or school is not a requirement to participate in P3.

Under this priority, we provide funding to an applicant that (1) meets absolute priority 1; (2) will serve disconnected youth in one or more Indian tribes; and (3) represents a partnership that includes one or more Indian tribes.

Competitive Preference Priorities: For FY 2014 and any subsequent year for which we make awards from the list of unfunded applicants from this competition, these priorities are competitive preference priorities. Under 34 CFR 75.105(c)(2)(i), up to an additional 5 points will be awarded to an application based on how well the application meets competitive preference priority 1, up to an additional 10 points to an application based on how well the application meets competitive preference priority 2, and an additional 2 points to an application that meets competitive preference priority 3.

Background for Competitive Preference Priorities 1 and 2:

Under competitive preference priorities 1 and 2, we will award points to applicants based on their plans to conduct independent impact evaluations of at least one service-delivery or operational component of their pilots, in addition to participating in the national P3 evaluation, which is discussed in the Program Requirements section of this notice. In proposing these site-specific impact evaluations, applicants should use the strongest possible designs and research methods and use high-quality administrative data in order to maximize confidence in the evaluation findings and minimize the costs of conducting these evaluations. Federal start-up funds and blended funds may be used to finance these evaluations, which will augment the evidence that is gained through any impact studies that are included in the national P3 evaluation.

Competitive Preference Priority 1 -- Quasi-Experimental Site-Specific Evaluations (Up to 5 points).

Under this priority, competitive preference will be given to applicants that propose to conduct an independent evaluation of the impacts on disconnected youth of their overall program or specific components of their program using a quasi-experimental[12] design. Proposals will be scored based on the clarity and feasibility of the proposed evaluation design and the applicants' demonstrated expertise in planning and conducting a quasi-experimental evaluation study.

Competitive Preference Priority 2 -- Experimental Site-Specific Evaluations (Up to 10 points).

Under this priority, competitive preference will be given to applicants that propose to conduct an independent evaluation of the impacts of their overall program or components of their program on disconnected youth using a randomized controlled trial.[13] Applicants' proposals will

---

[12] "Quasi-experimental design" means a study using a design that attempts to approximate an experimental design by identifying a comparison group that is similar to the treatment group in important respects. These studies, depending on design and implementation, can meet ED's What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards with reservations. (34 CFR 77.1(c); see also the What Works Clearinghouse Procedures and Standards Handbook, Version 3.0, March 2014, available at: http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/pdf/reference_resources/wwc_procedures_v3_0_standards_handbook.pdf.)

[13] "Randomized controlled trial" means a study that employs random assignment of, to give education-based examples, students, teachers, classrooms, schools, or districts to receive the intervention being evaluated (the treatment group) or not to receive the intervention (the control group). The estimated effectiveness of the intervention is the difference between the average outcome for the treatment group and for the control group. These studies, depending on design and implementation, can meet ED's What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards without reservations. (34 CFR 77.1(c); see also the What Works Clearinghouse Procedures and Standards Handbook, Version 3.0, March 2014, available at: http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/pdf/reference_resources/wwc_procedures_v3_0_standards_handbook.pdf)

be scored based on the clarity and feasibility of the proposed evaluation design and the applicants' demonstrated expertise in planning and conducting experimental evaluation studies.

Please see Appendix A for the requirements for evaluation proposals that are related to competitive preference priorities 1 and 2.

Competitive Preference Priority 3 -- Promise Zones (0 or 2 points).

Background:

Under this priority, competitive preference will be given to applicants that propose projects that are designed to serve and coordinate with a federally designated Promise Zone. Promise Zone designees have committed to establishing comprehensive, coordinated approaches in order to ensure that America's most vulnerable children succeed from cradle to career. In January 2014, President Obama announced the first five Promise Zones, located in: The Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma, Los Angeles, Philadelphia, San Antonio, and Kentucky Highlands. This designation is designed to assist local leaders in creating jobs, increasing economic activity, improving educational opportunities, leveraging private investment, and reducing violent crime in high-poverty urban, rural, and tribal communities. By partnering with Promise Zone designees, the Federal government will help communities access the resources and expertise they need--including the resources from various neighborhood revitalization initiatives--to ensure that Federal programs and resources support the efforts to transform these communities.

Priority:

This priority is for projects that are designed to serve and coordinate with a federally designated Promise Zone.

Note: Applicants should submit a letter of support from the lead organization of a designated Promise Zone describing the contribution of the applicant's proposed activities. A list of designated Promise Zones and lead organizations can be found at http://hud.gov/promisezones.

Application Requirements:

The following requirements apply to all applications submitted under this competition. Any application that does not include the required documents or information will not be considered.

(a) Statement of Need for a Defined Target Population.

(1) The applicant must define the target population to be served, based on data and analysis demonstrating the need for services within the relevant geographic area. The target population must be consistent with the population identified by section 526(a)(2) of the Act.

(2) The applicant's statement of need must include data demonstrating how the target population lags behind other groups in achieving the outcomes that the pilot will seek to attain, including an analysis of disparities in circumstances and outcomes among the target population and these other groups. These data must be based on a needs assessment that was conducted or updated within the past three years using representative data on youth from the jurisdiction(s) proposing the pilot. Applicants do not need to include a copy of the needs assessment with the application, but must identify when the assessment was conducted.

(b) Flexibility, including waivers.

(1) Federal requests for flexibility, including waivers. The applicant must describe the Federal flexibility that is needed to implement the proposed pilot and to improve outcomes for the target population, focusing on changes to major program requirements that would otherwise inhibit implementation. Flexibility involves both the ability to blend funds, thereby aligning certain administrative activities, and other waivers of program requirements. Examples of

potential requests for flexibility include, but are not limited to: changes to eligibility requirements, allowable uses of funds, or performance reporting. Applicants must cite the specific Federal statutory, regulatory, or other requirements for which they are requesting flexibility. (More information on flexibility, including waivers, is provided in the FAQ section of the application package.)

Note: The waiver request process for P3, which is part of the application process, differs from standard agency processes. Applicants do not need to submit separate waiver requests or information to the respective agencies outside of the P3 application process.

(2) Non-Federal flexibility, including waivers. In addition to Federal flexibility, successful implementation of proposals may also depend on flexibility related to requirements imposed at the State, local, or tribal level. The Agencies do not have the authority to waive non-Federal requirements. Applicants therefore must identify the specific State, local, or tribal policies, regulations, or other requirements that may impede the pilot's ability to achieve its goals so that, if the proposed pilot and flexibility, including waivers, are approved, requirements across non-Federal levels of government are aligned to support effective implementation. Applicants must provide written assurance that:

(A) The State, local, or tribal government(s) with authority to grant any needed non-Federal flexibility, including waivers, will approve such flexibility within 60 days of an applicant's designation as a pilot finalist; or

(B) Non-Federal flexibility, including waivers, is not needed in order to successfully implement the pilots.

(c) Project Design.

The applicant must present a project design for how it will improve specific outcomes for the target population. The design must indicate the proposed length of the pilot, which may not extend beyond September 30, 2018, and whether and how the applicant intends to incorporate future funding, including FY 2015 funding, into the multi-year project if Congress extends P3 authority.[14] Applicants may propose to expand the number of Federal programs supporting pilot activities using FY 2015 or other future funding beyond the Federal programs proposed using FY 2014 funds. The applicant's design must include the following elements.

(1) An explanation of how the strategies and activities that the pilot will employ are based on (or informed by) available research evidence.[15]

---

[14] Authority for pilots to blend funds for future years is subject to Congressional action as well as agency approval. However, because the Agencies will evaluate applications, in part, based on their multi-year plans, an applicant should provide as much information as possible about its future plans. Once pilots are selected, the Agencies may consider changes, including changes in scope and objectives, to pilot designs in subsequent years as a result of new funding streams. The reason for considering those changes is that, because P3 is intended to test a new approach to improving outcomes for disconnected youth, the pilots that demonstrate successful performance and effective governance processes may be able to build on these gains by using additional funding streams and/or including additional partners in future years.

[15] The best evidence for the expected effects of proposed interventions and reforms will be based on one or more studies using a randomized controlled trial. The next best evidence will be studies using a quasi-experimental (matched comparison group). Some studies that use these designs have been reviewed and are available in Federal registries of evidence-based interventions, such as the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) (http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/) and the Clearinghouse on Labor Evaluation and Research (CLEAR) (http://clear.dol.gov/). Correlational analysis may also be used as evidence to support an applicant's proposed reform. More information on Federal registries is provided in the FAQ section of the application package. Applicants are encouraged to identify (and cite) studies that support their proposed pilot strategies and activities (whether from Federal registries or other sources) to explain the strengths and limitations of the existing evidence

<u>Note</u>: Applicants must cite the studies on service interventions and system reform that informed their pilot design and explain the relevance of the cited evidence to the proposed project.

  (2) A graphic depiction (not longer than one page) of the pilot's logic model[16] that illustrates the underlying theory of how the pilot's strategy will produce intended outcomes. More information on logic models is provided in the FAQ section of the application package.

  (3) A description of the Federal program funds the applicant will blend in the pilot to carry out the activities described. In order to qualify for a pilot, the proposal must include at least two Federal programs: (a) that have policy goals related to P3; and (b) at least one of which is administered (in whole or in part) by a State, local, or tribal government (see Appendix B for examples of specific programs that applicants may want to consider). If applicable, the applicant should also describe any Federal funds that will support the proposed pilot or complementary activities by being braided rather than blended, such as funds that are not eligible under the Act to be blended, but may still support relevant activities under the pilot.

<u>Note</u>: Agencies will review the blending of FY 2014 competitive grants in pilots on a case-by-case basis in order to consider how the scope, objectives, and target populations of the existing award align with the proposed pilot. As discussed under the selection criteria, applicants will be scored, in part, based on the extent to which they demonstrate that alignment.

  (d) <u>Work Plan and Project Management</u>. The applicant must provide a detailed work plan that describes how the proposed work will be accomplished. The applicant must describe the professional qualifications that will be required of the project manager and other key personnel to ensure proper management of pilot activities.

  (e) <u>Partnership Capacity and Management</u>. The applicant must--

  (1) Identify the proposed partners, including any and all State, local, and tribal entities and non-governmental organizations that would be involved in implementation of the pilot. Partnerships that cross programs and funding sources but are under the jurisdiction of a single agency or entity must identify the different sub-organizational units involved.

  (2) Provide assurance of the proposed partners' commitment, such as a memorandum of understanding (MOU) or letter of commitment. The assurance of commitment must be signed by the executive leader or other accountable senior representative of each relevant organization or agency and include, at a minimum: (a) a description of each proposed partner's commitment of financial or in-kind resources (if any); (b) how each proposed partner's existing vision and current and proposed activities align with those of the proposed pilot; and (c) how each proposed partner will be held accountable under the proposed governance structure.

  (3) Describe how the applicant and proposed partners will use and coordinate resources in order to improve outcomes for disconnected youth. This description may include whether proposed efforts are aligned with, or whether the applicants' and proposed partners' jurisdiction is participating in, complementary Administration initiatives or efforts, such as Promise Zones and Pay for Success, or efforts that are focused on populations such as foster youth, young men

---

and to describe how the proposed strategies and activities will take into account those strengths and limitations in the existing evidence. Applicants proposing reforms on which there is not yet research evidence (such as innovations that have not been formally tested or tested only on a small scale) must document how evidence or practice knowledge informed the proposed pilot design.

[16] "Logic model" (also referred to as theory of action) means a well-specified conceptual framework that identifies key components of the proposed process, product, strategy, or practice (i.e., the active "ingredients" that are hypothesized to be critical to achieving the relevant outcomes) and describes the relationships among the key components and outcomes, theoretically and operationally. (34 CFR 77.1(c).)

of color, or homeless youth. For projects that include a focus on placing youth in work-based training and employment opportunities, applicants should address engagement with business and industry in identifying employment opportunities and skills, defining competencies, designing programs, and developing curricula, when applicable.

Note: While applicants must describe how the proposed project will use and coordinate resources, participation in complementary initiatives or efforts of the Administration is not a requirement for participation in P3.

(f) Data and Evaluation Capacity.

(1) Applicants must describe the proposed partnership's data and evaluation capacity, including its ability to collect, analyze, and use data for decision-making, learning, continuous improvement, and accountability. Specifically, the applicant must describe the extent to which the proposed partners have done, and will continue to do, the following:

(A) Manage and maintain computerized administrative data systems to track program participants, services, and outcomes;

(B) Execute data-sharing agreements with programs or organizations to share information with program partners and evaluators for case management, performance management, and evaluation purposes, in accordance with Federal, State, and other privacy laws and requirements;

(C) Link or make progress toward linking programmatic data to administrative data from relevant government agencies;

(D) Collect, store, and make data available to program partners, researchers, and evaluators in accordance with Federal, State, and other privacy laws and regulations;

(E) Use data to determine cost-effective strategies for improving outcomes; and

(F) Regularly analyze program data to assess progress, identify operational strengths and weaknesses, and determine how implementation could be strengthened to improve outcomes.

(2) The applicant must propose outcome measures and interim indicators to gauge pilot performance. At least one outcome measure must be in the domain of education, and at least one outcome measure must be in the domain of employment. Applicants may specify additional employment and education outcome measures, as well as outcome measures in other domains of well-being, such as criminal justice, physical and mental health, and housing. Regardless of the outcome domain, applicants must identify at least one interim indicator for each proposed outcome measure. Examples of education- and employment-related outcome measures and interim indicators include:

• For High School Diploma Attainment: high school enrollment, attendance, and grade promotion;

• For Community College Completion: class attendance and credit accumulation; and

• For Sustained Employment in Career Field: job placement or acquisition, employment retention, and earnings.

The specific outcome measures and interim indicators the applicant uses should be grounded in its logic model, and informed by applicable program results or research, as appropriate. More information on outcomes and interim indicators is available in the FAQs included in the application package.

(3) For each proposed outcome measure and interim indicator, the applicant must describe:

(A) The methodology and progress milestones (such as monthly, quarterly, annually) that will be used to assess progress;

84

(B) The sources of data that will be used, and whether the data are subject to audit or other means of validation for accuracy; and

(C) The frequency with which data will be recorded by the pilot and the frequency with which the applicant proposes to report on outcome measures, interim indicators, and project progress milestones to the Federal government.

Note: Lead Federal agencies will work with selected pilots to finalize the reporting requirements and to determine the frequency of reporting as part of the performance partnership agreement. The lead Federal agency for each pilot reserves the right to negotiate the selected interim indicators, outcome measures, and project progress milestones, and to add relevant performance measures as part of the performance agreement process.

(g)   Budget and Budget Narrative.

(1) The applicant must identify specific funding levels for the funding sources to be used in the pilot, specifically--

(A) For each Federal program, the amount of funds to be blended and the percentage of total program funding received by the applicant that this amount represents;

(B) The total amount of funds from all Federal programs that would be blended under the pilot;

(C) The source and amount of any non-Federal funds and programs, including funds from State, local, tribal, philanthropic, and other sources, that will be used for the pilot, as well as a description of how those funds and programs will complement Federal funds in the implementation of the proposed strategy and activities; and

(D) The total amount of all funds, Federal and non-Federal, that will be used to support activities related to the pilot.

(2) The applicant must indicate whether in-kind contributions or other braided Federal funds will be used to support the pilot and, if so, identify these contributions.

(3) The applicant must provide a detailed budget and a budget narrative that describe how the pilot will use the requested start-up grant funds, as well as the FY 2014 and FY 2015 Federal program funds that the applicant proposes to blend. The budget must cover all years during which FY 2014 and FY 2015 Federal funds would be used to support the pilot and must include at least the first full year of the pilot. The applicant should request a specific start-up grant amount that is between $400,000 and $700,000 and describe how the pilot will use these start-up funds to support effective implementation, such as planning, governance, technical assistance, site-specific evaluation, capacity-building, and coordination activities. Examples of other uses include supporting the measurement of pilot performance and results, such as modifications to information systems.

Program Requirements:

(a)   In addition to any site-specific evaluations that pilots may undertake, the Agencies are initiating a national P3 evaluation. Each P3 pilot must participate fully in any federally sponsored P3 evaluation activity, including the national evaluation of P3, which will consist of the analysis of participant characteristics and outcomes, an implementation analysis at all sites, and rigorous impact evaluations of promising interventions in selected sites. The applicant must acknowledge in writing its understanding of these requirements by submitting the form provided in Appendix A, "Evaluation Commitment Form," as an attachment to its application.

(b)   All P3 pilots must participate in a community of practice[17] that includes an annual in-person meeting of pilot sites (paid with grant funding that must be reflected in the pilot budget submitted; see the FAQ in the application package for more information) and virtual peer-to-peer learning activities. This commitment involves each pilot site working with the lead Federal agency on a plan for supporting its technical assistance needs, which can include learning activities supported by foundations or other non-Federal organizations as well as activities financed with Federal funds for the pilot.

(c)   P3 pilots must secure necessary consent from parents, guardians, students, or youth program participants to access data for their pilots and any evaluations, in accordance with applicable Federal, State, local, and tribal laws. Applicants must explain how they propose to ensure compliance with Federal, State, local, and tribal privacy laws and regulations as pilot partners share data to support effective coordination of services and link data to track outcome measures and interim indicators at the individual level to perform, where applicable, a low-cost, high-quality evaluation.

(d)   Each P3 pilot, along with other non-Federal government entities involved in the partnership, must enter into a performance agreement that will include, at a minimum, the following (as required by section 526(c)(2) of the Act):

(1) The length of the agreement;

(2) The Federal programs and federally funded services that are involved in the pilot;

(3) The Federal discretionary funds that are being used in the pilot;

(4) The non-Federal funds that are involved in the pilot, by source (which may include private funds as well as governmental funds) and by amount;

(5) The State, local, or tribal programs that are involved in the pilot and their respective roles;

(6) The populations to be served by the pilot;

(7) The cost-effective Federal oversight procedures that will be used for the purpose of maintaining the necessary level of accountability for the use of the Federal discretionary funds;

(8) The cost-effective State, local, or tribal oversight procedures that will be used for the purpose of maintaining the necessary level of accountability for the use of the Federal discretionary funds;

(9) The outcome (or outcomes) that the pilot is designed to achieve;

(10) The appropriate, reliable, and objective outcome-measurement methodology that will be used to determine whether the pilot is achieving, and has achieved, specified outcomes;

(11) The statutory, regulatory, or administrative requirements related to Federal mandatory programs that are barriers to achieving improved outcomes of the pilot;[18] and

---

[17] "Community of practice" means a group of pilots that agrees to interact regularly to solve a persistent problem or improve practice in an area that is important to them and the success of their projects. Establishment of communities of practice under P3 will enable pilots to meet, discuss, and collaborate with each other regarding grantee projects.

[18] The Agencies cannot grant waivers of requirements under mandatory programs or programs funded outside of Division H of the Act, except where the agency has existing administrative authority to provide waivers. The Act requires that P3 performance agreements list barriers in mandatory programs even though P3 authority does not authorize these programs to be blended for pilot purposes. While these programs' funds are not eligible for blending funds under P3, applicants are encouraged to identify strategies for better coordinating the delivery of services with these programs to the extent possible. Medicaid, TANF and certain foster care programs authorized by the Social Security Act are examples of mandatory programs.

(12) Criteria for determining when a pilot is not achieving the specified outcomes that it is designed to achieve and subsequent steps, including:

(i) The consequences that will result; and

(ii) The corrective actions that will be taken in order to increase the likelihood that the pilot will achieve such specified outcomes.

Waiver of Proposed Rulemaking: Under the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. 553), the Department of Education generally offers interested parties the opportunity to comment on proposed definitions, requirements, and selection criteria. However, Section 437(d)(1) of the General Education Provisions Act (GEPA) (20 U.S.C. 1232(d)(1)) allows the Secretary to exempt the first grant competition under a new or substantially revised program authority from rulemaking requirements and regulations.

This is the first P3 grant competition and, therefore, it qualifies for this exemption. In order to ensure timely awards, the Secretary has decided to forgo public comment on the priorities, definitions, requirements, and selection criteria under section 437(d)(1) of GEPA. These priorities, definitions, requirements, and selection criteria will apply to the FY 2014 grant competition and any subsequent year for which we make awards from the list of unfunded applicants from this competition.

Program Authority: Section 526 of Division H of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2014 (Public Law No. 113-76).

Applicable Regulations:

This application notice (also referred to as a notice inviting applications (NIA)) is being published before the Department adopts the Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements in 2 CFR part 200. We expect to publish interim final regulations that would adopt those requirements before December 26, 2014, and make those regulations effective on that date. Because grants awarded under this NIA will likely be made after the Department adopts the requirements in 2 CFR part 200, we list as applicable regulations both those that are currently effective and those that will be effective at the time the Department makes grants.

The current regulations follow: (a) The Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR) in 34 CFR parts 75, 77, 79, 80, 81, 82, 84, 86, 97, 98, and 99. (b) The OMB Guidelines to Agencies on Governmentwide Debarment and Suspension (Nonprocurement) in 2 CFR part 180, as adopted and amended as regulations of the Department in 2 CFR part 3485.

At the time we award grants under this NIA, the following regulations will apply: (a) EDGAR in 34 CFR parts 75, 77, 79, 81, 82, 84, 86, 97, 98, and 99. (b) The OMB Guidelines to Agencies on Governmentwide Debarment and Suspension (Nonprocurement)in 2 CFR part 180, as adopted and amended as regulations of the Department in 2 CFR part 3485, and the Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards in 2 CFR part 200, as adopted and amended in 2 CFR part 3474.

Regardless of the timing of publication, the following also applies to this NIA: The notice of final priority--Promise Zones, published in the Federal Register on March 27, 2014 (79 FR 17035).

Note: The regulations in 34 CFR part 79 apply to all applicants except federally recognized Indian tribes.

II. Award Information

Type of Award: Cooperative agreement.

Estimated Available Funds: Up to $7,100,000.

 Contingent upon the availability of funds and the quality of applications, we may make additional awards in subsequent years from the list of unfunded applicants from this competition.

Estimated Range of Awards: $400,000 to $700,000.

Estimated Average Size of Award: $550,000.

Estimated Number of Awards: 10.

Note: The Agencies are not bound by any estimates in this notice.

Project Period: Not to extend beyond September 30, 2018.

III. Eligibility Information

 1. Eligible applicants: An application must be submitted by a lead applicant on behalf of a partnership that involves all public and private organizations (including non-profit, business, industry, and labor organizations) that will participate in pilot implementation and governance. The lead applicant must be a State, local, or tribal government entity, represented by a Chief Executive, such as a governor, mayor, or other elected leader, or the head of a State, local, or tribal agency. In addition to formally submitting the application, the official representing the lead applicant will serve as the primary official who is responsible for the pilot project if the proposal is selected as a pilot. A private, non-profit organization is not an eligible applicant for a pilot; however, it may have a significant role in the design, governance, and implementation of a pilot and may, if appropriate, be a signatory to the performance agreement. For more information on the potential roles and participation of non-profit organizations in a pilot, see the FAQs in the application package.

 For each application selected as a pilot, the respective representatives of all participating State, local, and tribal governments must be parties to the performance agreement governing the pilot. For example, when a P3 pilot proposed at the local or tribal level is financed with funds administered by a State, the administering State agency must be a party to the agreement and must agree to any waivers or other proposals that are needed to implement the pilot and also fall under that State agency's jurisdiction. If a State or group of States proposes a pilot that would be implemented only in certain communities and would involve participation by local government jurisdictions, these jurisdictions will need to be party to the agreement and agree to implement the pilot as proposed by the State(s).

 2. Cost-Sharing or Matching: This program does not require cost-sharing or matching.

IV. Application and Submission Information

 1. Address to Request Application Package: Braden Goetz, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW., room 11141, PCP, Washington, DC 20202. Telephone: (202) 245-7405.

 If you use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) or a text telephone (TTY), call the Federal Relay Service (FRS), toll free, at 1-800-877-8339. Individuals with disabilities can obtain a copy of the application package in an accessible format (e.g., braille, large print, audiotape, or compact disc) by contacting the program contact person listed in this section.

 2. a. Content and Form of Application Submission: Requirements concerning the content of an application, together with the forms you must submit, are in the application package for this competition.

Notice of Intent to Apply: [INSERT DATE 45 DAYS AFTER DATE OF PUBLICATION IN THE FEDERAL REGISTER].

Note: Submission of a notice of intent to apply is optional.

Page Limit: The application narrative is where you, the applicant, address the selection criteria that reviewers use to evaluate your application. We recommend that you limit the application narrative to no more than 40 pages, using the following standards:

• A "page" is 8.5" x 11", on one side only, with 1" margins at the top, bottom, and both sides.

• Double space (no more than three lines per vertical inch) all text in the application narrative, including titles, headings, footnotes, quotations, references, and captions, as well as all text in charts, tables, figures, and graphs.

• Use a font that is either 12 point or larger or no smaller than 10 pitch (characters per inch).

• Use one of the following fonts: Times New Roman, Courier, Courier New, or Arial. An application submitted in any other font (including Times Roman or Arial Narrow) will not be accepted.

The recommended page limit does not apply to the application cover sheet; the detailed annual budget; the assurances and certifications; or the abstract, the absolute and competitive priorities, the resumes, the bibliography, or the letters of commitment and MOUs. However, the recommended page limit does apply to all of the application narrative section.

.

b. <u>Submission of Proprietary Information</u>:

Given the types of projects that may be proposed in applications for Performance Partnership Pilots, your application may include business information that you consider proprietary. The Department's regulations define "business information" in 34 CFR 5.11. Because we plan to make successful applications available to the public, and may make all applications available, you may wish to request confidentiality of business information.

Consistent with Executive Order 12600, please designate in your application any information that you feel is exempt from disclosure under Exemption 4 of the Freedom of Information Act. In the appropriate Appendix section of your application, under "Other Attachments Form," please list the page number or numbers on which we can find this information. For additional information, please see 34 CFR 5.11(c).

3. <u>Submission Dates and Times</u>:

Applications Available: [INSERT DATE OF PUBLICATION IN THE FEDERAL REGISTER].

Deadline for Notice of Intent to Apply: [INSERT DATE 45 DAYS AFTER DATE OF PUBLICATION IN THE FEDERAL REGISTER].

<u>Note</u>: Submission of a notice of intent to apply is optional.

Deadline for Transmittal of Applications: [INSERT DATE 100 DAYS AFTER DATE OF PUBLICATION IN THE FEDERAL REGISTER].

Applications for grants under this competition must be submitted electronically using the Grants.gov Apply site (Grants.gov). For information (including dates and times) about how to submit your application electronically, or in paper format by mail or hand delivery if you qualify for an exception to the electronic submission requirement, please refer to section IV. 7. <u>Other Submission Requirements</u> of this notice.

We do not consider an application that does not comply with the deadline requirements. Individuals with disabilities who need an accommodation or auxiliary aid in connection with the application process should contact the person listed under <u>For Further Information Contact</u> in section VII of this notice. If the Department provides an accommodation or auxiliary aid to an

individual with a disability in connection with the application process, the individual's application remains subject to all other requirements and limitations in this notice.

<u>Deadline for Intergovernmental Review</u>: [INSERT DATE 160 DAYS AFTER PUBLICATION IN THE FEDERAL REGISTER].

      4. <u>Intergovernmental Review</u>: This program is subject to Executive Order 12372 and the regulations in 34 CFR part 79.

Information about Intergovernmental Review of Federal Programs under Executive Order 12372 is in the application package for this competition.

      5. <u>Funding Restrictions</u>: We reference regulations outlining funding restrictions in the <u>Applicable Regulations</u> section of this notice.

    6. <u>Data Universal Numbering System Number, Taxpayer Identification Number, and System for Award Management</u>: To do business with the Department of Education, you must--

    a. Have a Data Universal Numbering System (DUNS) number and a Taxpayer Identification Number (TIN);

    b. Register both your DUNS number and TIN with the System for Award Management (SAM) (formerly the Central Contractor Registry (CCR)), the Government's primary registrant database;

    c. Provide your DUNS number and TIN on your application; and

    d. Maintain an active SAM registration with current information while your application is under review by the Department and, if you are awarded a grant, during the project period.

      You can obtain a DUNS number from Dun and Bradstreet. A DUNS number can be created within one to two business days.

      If you are a corporate entity, agency, institution, or organization, you can obtain a TIN from the Internal Revenue Service. If you are an individual, you can obtain a TIN from the Internal Revenue Service or the Social Security Administration. If you need a new TIN, please allow 2-5 weeks for your TIN to become active.

The SAM registration process can take approximately seven business days, but may take upwards of several weeks, depending on the completeness and accuracy of the data entered into the SAM database by an entity. Thus, if you think you might want to apply for Federal financial assistance under a program administered by the Department, please allow sufficient time to obtain and register your DUNS number and TIN. We strongly recommend that you register early.

<u>Note</u>: Once your SAM registration is active, you will need to allow 24 to 48 hours for the information to be available in Grants.gov and before you can submit an application through Grants.gov.

If you are currently registered with SAM, you may not need to make any changes. However, please make certain that the TIN associated with your DUNS number is correct. Also note that you will need to update your registration annually. This may take three or more business days. Information about SAM is available at www.SAM.gov. To further assist you with obtaining and registering your DUNS number and TIN in SAM or updating your existing SAM account, we have prepared a SAM.gov Tip Sheet, which you can find at: http://www2.ed.gov/fund/grant/apply/sam-faqs.html.

      In addition, if you are submitting your application via Grants.gov, you must (1) be designated by your organization as an Authorized Organization Representative (AOR); and (2) register yourself with Grants.gov as an AOR. Details on these steps are outlined at the following Grants.gov Web page: www.grants.gov/web/grants/register.html.

7. Other Submission Requirements:

Applications for competition must be submitted electronically unless you qualify for an exception to this requirement in accordance with the instructions in this section.

a. Electronic Submission of Applications.

Applications for grants under the Performance Partnerships Pilots program, CFDA number 84.420, must be submitted electronically using the Governmentwide Grants.gov Apply site at www.Grants.gov. Through this site, you will be able to download a copy of the application package, complete it offline, and then upload and submit your application. You may not e-mail an electronic copy of a grant application to us.

We will reject your application if you submit it in paper format unless, as described elsewhere in this section, you qualify for one of the exceptions to the electronic submission requirement and submit, no later than two weeks before the application deadline date, a written statement to the Department that you qualify for one of these exceptions. Further information regarding calculation of the date that is two weeks before the application deadline date is provided later in this section under Exception to Electronic Submission Requirement.

You may access the electronic grant application for P3 at www.Grants.gov. You must search for the downloadable application package for this competition by the CFDA number. Do not include the CFDA number's alpha suffix in your search (e.g., search for 84.420, not 84.420A).

Please note the following:

• When you enter the Grants.gov site, you will find information about submitting an application electronically through the site, as well as the hours of operation.

• Applications received by Grants.gov are date and time stamped. Your application must be fully uploaded and submitted and must be date and time stamped by the Grants.gov system no later than 4:30:00 p.m., Washington, DC time, on the application deadline date. Except as otherwise noted in this section, we will not accept your application if it is received--that is, date and time stamped by the Grants.gov system--after 4:30:00 p.m., Washington, DC time, on the application deadline date. We do not consider an application that does not comply with the deadline requirements. When we retrieve your application from Grants.gov, we will notify you if we are rejecting your application because it was date and time stamped by the Grants.gov system after 4:30:00 p.m., Washington, DC time, on the application deadline date.

• The amount of time it can take to upload an application will vary depending on a variety of factors, including the size of the application and the speed of your Internet connection. Therefore, we strongly recommend that you do not wait until the application deadline date to begin the submission process through Grants.gov.

• You should review and follow the Education Submission Procedures for submitting an application through Grants.gov that are included in the application package for this competition to ensure that you submit your application in a timely manner to the Grants.gov system. You can also find the Education Submission Procedures pertaining to Grants.gov under News and Events on the Department's G5 system home page at www.G5.gov.

• You will not receive additional point value because you submit your application in electronic format, nor will we penalize you if you qualify for an exception to the electronic submission requirement, as described elsewhere in this section, and submit your application in paper format.

• You must submit all documents electronically, including all information you typically provide on the following forms: the Application for Federal Assistance (SF 424), the

Department of Education Supplemental Information for SF 424, Budget Information--Non-Construction Programs (ED 524), and all necessary assurances and certifications.

• You must upload any narrative sections and all other attachments to your application as files in a PDF (Portable Document) read-only, non-modifiable format. Do not upload an interactive or fillable PDF file. If you upload a file type other than a read-only, non-modifiable PDF or submit a password-protected file, we will not review that material.

• Your electronic application must comply with any page-limit requirements described in this notice.

• After you electronically submit your application, you will receive from Grants.gov an automatic notification of receipt that contains a Grants.gov tracking number. (This notification indicates receipt by Grants.gov only, not receipt by the Department.) The Department then will retrieve your application from Grants.gov and send a second notification to you by e-mail. This second notification indicates that the Department has received your application and has assigned your application a PR/Award number (an ED-specified identifying number unique to your application).

• We may request that you provide us original signatures on forms at a later date.

Application Deadline Date Extension in Case of Technical Issues with the Grants.gov System: If you are experiencing problems submitting your application through Grants.gov, please contact the Grants.gov Support Desk, toll free, at 1-800-518-4726. You must obtain a Grants.gov Support Desk Case Number and must keep a record of it.

If you are prevented from electronically submitting your application on the application deadline date because of technical problems with the Grants.gov system, we will grant you an extension until 4:30:00 p.m., Washington, DC time, the following business day to enable you to transmit your application electronically or by hand delivery. You also may mail your application by following the mailing instructions described elsewhere in this notice.

If you submit an application after 4:30:00 p.m., Washington, DC time, on the application deadline date, please contact the person listed under For Further Information Contact in section VII of this notice and provide an explanation of the technical problem you experienced with Grants.gov, along with the Grants.gov Support Desk Case Number. We will accept your application if we can confirm that a technical problem occurred with the Grants.gov system and that that problem affected your ability to submit your application by 4:30:00 p.m., Washington, DC time, on the application deadline date. The Department will contact you after a determination is made on whether your application will be accepted.

Note: The extensions to which we refer in this section apply only to the unavailability of, or technical problems with, the Grants.gov system. We will not grant you an extension if you failed to fully register to submit your application to Grants.gov before the application deadline date and time or if the technical problem you experienced is unrelated to the Grants.gov system.

Exception to Electronic Submission Requirement: You qualify for an exception to the electronic submission requirement, and may submit your application in paper format, if you are unable to submit an application through the Grants.gov system because—

• You do not have access to the Internet; or

• You do not have the capacity to upload large documents to the Grants.gov system; and

• No later than two weeks before the application deadline date (14 calendar days or, if the fourteenth calendar day before the application deadline date falls on a Federal holiday, the next business day following the Federal holiday), you mail or fax a written statement to the

Department, explaining which of the two grounds for an exception prevent you from using the Internet to submit your application.

If you mail your written statement to the Department, it must be postmarked no later than two weeks before the application deadline date. If you fax your written statement to the Department, we must receive the faxed statement no later than two weeks before the application deadline date.

Address and mail or fax your statement to: Braden Goetz, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW., room 11141, PCP, Washington, DC 20202. FAX: (202) 245-7838.

Your paper application must be submitted in accordance with the mail or hand delivery instructions described in this notice.

b. Submission of Paper Applications by Mail.

If you qualify for an exception to the electronic submission requirement, you may mail (through the U.S. Postal Service or a commercial carrier) your application to the Department. You must mail the original and two copies of your application, on or before the application deadline date, to the Department at the following address:

U.S. Department of Education
Application Control Center
Attention: CFDA Number 84.420
LBJ Basement Level 1
400 Maryland Avenue, SW.
Washington, DC 20202-4260

You must show proof of mailing consisting of one of the following:

(1) A legibly dated U.S. Postal Service postmark.

(2) A legible mail receipt with the date of mailing stamped by the U.S. Postal Service.

(3) A dated shipping label, invoice, or receipt from a commercial carrier.

(4) Any other proof of mailing acceptable to the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Education.

If you mail your application through the U.S. Postal Service, we do not accept either of the following as proof of mailing:

(1) A private metered postmark.

(2) A mail receipt that is not dated by the U.S. Postal Service.

If your application is postmarked after the application deadline date, we will not consider your application.

Note: The U.S. Postal Service does not uniformly provide a dated postmark. Before relying on this method, you should check with your local post office.

c. Submission of Paper Applications by Hand Delivery.

If you qualify for an exception to the electronic submission requirement, you (or a courier service) may deliver your paper application to the Department by hand. You must deliver the original and two copies of your application by hand, on or before the application deadline date, to the Department at the following address:

U.S. Department of Education
Application Control Center
Attention: CFDA Number 84.420
550 12th Street, SW.
Room 7039, Potomac Center Plaza

Washington, DC 20202-4260

The Application Control Center accepts hand deliveries daily between 8:00 a.m. and 4:30:00 p.m., Washington, DC time, except Saturdays, Sundays, and Federal holidays.
Note for Mail or Hand Delivery of Paper Applications: If you mail or hand deliver your application to the Department--

       (1) You must indicate on the envelope and--if not provided by the Department--in Item 11 of the SF 424 the CFDA number, including suffix letter, if any, of the competition under which you are submitting your application; and

       (2) The Application Control Center will mail to you a notification of receipt of your grant application. If you do not receive this notification within 15 business days from the application deadline date, you should call the U.S. Department of Education Application Control Center at (202) 245-6288.

V. Application Review Information

       1. <u>Selection Criteria</u>. We are establishing the following selection criteria for the FY 2014 grant competition and any subsequent year for which we make awards from the list of unfunded applicants from this competition. Eligible applicants may receive up to 100 total points based on the extent to which their applications address these selection criteria. The number of points that may be awarded for each criterion is indicated in parentheses next to the criterion. An applicant's final score will include both points awarded based on selection criteria and also any points awarded for the three competitive preference priorities.

  A. <u>Need for Project (5 points)</u>

       In determining the need for the proposed project, we will consider the extent to which the applicant used a comprehensive needs assessment completed within the previous three years that draws on representative data on youth in the jurisdiction(s) to be served by the pilot that are disaggregated according to relevant demographic factors to: (1) show disparities in outcomes among key sub-populations; and (2) identify an appropriate target population of disconnected youth with a high level of need. Examples of relevant demographic factors include race, ethnicity, gender, age, disability status, involvement in systems such as foster care or justice, status as pregnant or parenting, and other key factors selected by the applicant.

  B. <u>Need for Requested Flexibility, including Blending of Funds and Other Waivers (10 points)</u>

       In determining the need for the requested flexibility, including blending of funds and other waivers, we will consider the following factors--

       (1) The extent to which the applicant presents evidence that specific Federal barriers are hindering successful achievement of outcomes for the target population of disconnected youth identified by the applicant and cites the relevant statute(s), regulation(s), and/or administrative requirement(s) for which it is seeking flexibility, including waivers (5 points); and
(2) The extent to which the applicant provides a justification of how requested flexibility, including blending funds and other waivers, will reduce barriers, increase efficiency, support implementation of the pilot, and produce significantly better outcomes for the target population(s) (5 points).

  C. <u>Project Design (25 Points)</u>

       In determining the strength of the project design, we will consider the following factors--

(1) The extent to which the applicant presents a clear and logical plan that is likely to improve outcomes significantly for the target population, by addressing the gaps and the disparities identified through the needs assessment, including the extent to which--

(a) The inputs and activities shown in the logic model are necessary and sufficient to achieve the project's objectives, and

(b) The assumptions of the logic model are identified and a rationale is provided for them. For example, applicants proposing job training or employment strategies should include data on the demand for particular occupations in the relevant geographic areas (10 points);

(2) The extent to which the applicant demonstrates that the pilot will use evidence-based and evidence-informed interventions, in addition to systems change, as documented by citations to the relevant evidence (5 points);

Note: Applicants should cite the studies on service interventions and system reform that informed their pilot design and explain the relevance of the cited evidence to the proposed project in terms of subject matter and evaluation evidence.

(3) The extent to which the pilot will provide intensive, comprehensive, and sustained service pathways and coordinated approaches that are likely to improve outcomes significantly over the short, medium, and long term by helping individuals progress seamlessly from one educational stepping stone to another, across work-based training and education, or through other relevant programmatic milestones to improve outcomes. For example, a pilot might prevent gaps in service that would jeopardize the achievement of outcomes by creating a seamless progression of services that provide continuous support as needed to the target population (5 points); and

(4) For Federal programs that are proposed to provide funding for pilots, the extent to which the applicant explains how the use of funds for the pilot: (a) will not result in denying or restricting the eligibility of individuals for services that (in whole or in part) are otherwise funded by these programs; and (b) based on the best available information, will not otherwise adversely affect vulnerable populations that are the recipients of those services. If the applicant proposes to include FY 2014 competitive grant funds that have already been awarded, the extent to which the applicant demonstrates that the scope, objectives, and target population(s) of the existing award align with the proposed pilot (see the FAQs included in the application package for more information) (5 points).

D. Work Plan and Project Management (10 points)

In determining the strength of the work plan and project management, we will consider the extent to which the applicant presents a strong work plan and project management approach that includes--

(1) A detailed timeline and implementation milestones, including--

(a) A statement of when any necessary preparatory work will be completed, which must be within 180 days of being awarded pilot start-up funding;

(b) The expected start date of a project manager, the expected award dates of contracts and other authorized subawards, and expected dates for establishing agreements among the partners;

(c) The start date of the pilot services, such as participant intake and services;

(d) When the partnership will begin to implement pilot services or changes to administrative systems and policy and which partners are responsible for key tasks;

(e) The number of participants expected to be served under the pilot for each period, such as quarterly or annually (for example, number of participants enrolled, and the number achieving specified education, employment, and other outcomes); and

(f) For an applicant that is proposing an evaluation (as described in competitive preference priorities 1 and 2), when it will begin evaluation activities, including execution of a contract with an independent evaluator.

(2) A description of how the proposed budget and budget narrative align with the work plan, identifying how each implementation milestone will be adequately funded as outlined in the proposed budget;

(3) A description of any existing or anticipated barriers to implementation and how they will be overcome; and

(4) A description of the professional qualifications that will be required of the project manager and other key personnel, including a description of how such qualifications are sufficient to ensure proper management of all grant activities, such as timely reporting and the ability to manage a strategic partnership (10 points).

Note: If the program manager or other key personnel are already on staff, the applicant should provide this person's resume or curriculum vitae.

E. Partnership Capacity (15 points)

In determining the strength and capacity of the proposed pilot partnership, we will consider the following factors--

(1) The extent to which the applicant demonstrates that it has an effective governance structure in which partners that are necessary to successfully implement the pilot are represented and partners have the necessary authority, resources, expertise, and incentives to achieve the pilot's goals, resolve unforeseen issues, and sustain efforts to the extent possible after the project period ends, including by demonstrating the extent to which, and how, participating partners have successfully collaborated to improve outcomes for disconnected youth in the past. The proposed governance structure should reflect a plan for effective cooperation across levels of government, including a description of the State, local, and tribal roles in the partnership, or across entities within the same level of government, to improve outcomes for disconnected youth, such as through coordinated program delivery, easier program navigation for participants, or identification and resolution of State and local policy barriers (10 points);

(2) The extent to which the applicant demonstrates that its proposal was designed with input from all relevant stakeholders, including disconnected youth and other community partners. Where the project design includes job training strategies, the extent of employer input and engagement in the identification of skills and competencies needed by employers, the development of the curriculum, and the offering of work-based learning opportunities, including pre-apprenticeship and registered apprenticeship, will be considered (5 points).

F. Data Capacity (30 points)

In determining the strength of the applicant's data capacity, we will consider the following factors--

(1) The extent to which the applicant demonstrates the capacity to collect, analyze, and use data for decision-making, learning, continuous improvement, and accountability, and has a strong plan to bridge the gaps in its ability to do so, including the extent to which the applicant has, and will continue to:

(a) Manage and maintain computerized administrative data systems to track program participants, services, and outcomes;

(b) Execute data-sharing agreements with programs or organizations to share information with program partners and evaluators for case management, performance management, and evaluation purposes in accordance with Federal, State, local, and other privacy laws and requirements;

(c) Use data to determine cost-effective strategies for improving outcomes; and

(d) Regularly analyze program data to assess the pilot's progress, identify operational strengths and weaknesses and determine how implementation can be strengthened to improve outcomes (5 points).

(2) The strength of the applicant's plan to manage and link data in ways that comply with all relevant Federal, State, and local privacy laws and regulations to ensure the protection of personally identifiable information (5 points).

(3) The extent to which the applicant shows how the outcomes of the proposed pilot are likely to be a significant improvement compared with what might have occurred in its absence, both during the pilot project period and, for longer-term outcomes, beyond the project period (10 points).

(4) The extent to which proposed outcome measures and interim indicators, as well as their measurement methodologies and progress milestones, are appropriate and sufficient to gauge progress toward pilot objectives (5 points).

(5) The extent to which the data sources for the outcome measures and interim indicators will be accessible and independently audited or validated for accuracy (5 points).

G. Budget and Budget Narrative (5 points)

In determining the adequacy of the resources that will be committed to support the project, we will consider the extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the project.

2. Review and Selection Process: The Department will screen applications that are submitted in accordance with the requirements in this notice, and will determine which applications are eligible to be read based on whether they have met the eligibility and application requirements established by this notice.

The Department will use reviewers with knowledge and expertise on issues related to improving outcomes for disconnected youth to score the selection criteria. The Department will thoroughly screen all reviewers for conflicts of interest to ensure a fair and competitive review. Reviewers with expertise in evaluation will score competitive preference priorities 1 and 2. The Department will assign 2 points for competitive preference priority 3 if the application includes a letter from the lead organization of a designated Promise Zone describing the contribution of the applicant's proposed activities.

Technical scoring. Reviewers will read, prepare a written evaluation, and assign a technical score to the applications assigned to their panel, using the selection criteria provided in this notice, competitive preference priorities 1 and 2, and the scoring rubric in Appendix D.

The Department will then prepare a rank order of applications based on their technical scores.

Flexibility, including blending of funds and other waivers. Using this rank order, representatives of the Agencies that administer programs under which flexibility in Federal requirements is sought will evaluate whether the flexibility, including blending of funds and other waivers, requested by top-scoring applicants meets the statutory requirements for Performance Partnership Pilots and is otherwise appropriate (as described in Appendix B) . For example, if an applicant is seeking flexibility under programs administered by HHS and DOL, its

requests for flexibility will be reviewed by HHS and DOL officials. Applicants may be asked to participate in an interview at this point in the process in order to clarify requests for flexibility and other aspects of their proposals.

For applicants that propose to include funds from FY 2014 competitive grants that have already been awarded, the flexibility review will include consideration of whether the scope, objectives, and target populations of the existing competitive grant award(s) are sufficiently and appropriately aligned with the proposed pilot. Any changes in terms and conditions of the existing competitive grant award(s) required for pilot purposes must be justified by the applicant (see FAQ included in the application package). The Agencies will review those requests on a case-by-case basis.

If 25 or fewer applications are received, the technical scoring and reviews of flexibility requests may be conducted concurrently.

Selecting finalists. Agency officials may recommend the selection of up to ten projects as Performance Partnership Pilots. In accordance with 34 CFR 75.217(d) and in consultation with the other Agencies, the Secretary will select finalists after considering the rank ordering, the recommendations of the Agencies that administer the programs for which the applicants are seeking flexibility and other information including an applicant's performance and use of funds and compliance history under a previous award under any Agency program. In selecting pilots, the agencies may consider high-ranking applications meeting absolute priority 2 or absolute priority 3 separately to ensure that there is a diversity of pilots. In addition, as required by the Act, each pilot must meet all statutory criteria.

For each finalist, a lead Federal agency designated by OMB will negotiate a performance agreement. If a performance agreement cannot be finalized for any applicant within 60 days, an alternative applicant may be selected as a finalist instead. The recommended projects will be considered finalists until performance agreements are signed by all parties, and pilot designation and start-up grant funds will be awarded only after execution of each finalist's performance agreement.

In addition, in making a competitive grant award, the Secretary also requires various assurances including those applicable to Federal civil rights laws that prohibit discrimination in programs or activities receiving Federal financial assistance from the Department of Education (34 CFR 100.4, 104.5, 106.4, 108.8, and 110.23).

3. Special Conditions: Under current 34 CFR 74.14 and 80.12 and, when grants are made under this NIA, 2 CFR 3474.10, the Secretary may impose special conditions and, in appropriate circumstances, high-risk conditions on a grant if the applicant or grantee is not financially stable; has a history of unsatisfactory performance; has a financial or other management system that does not meet the standards in 34 CFR parts 74 or 80, as applicable or, when grants are awarded, the standards in 2 CFR part 200, subpart D; has not fulfilled the conditions of a prior grant; or is otherwise not responsible.

VI. Award Administration Information

1. Award Notices: If your application is successful, we notify your U.S. Representative and U.S. Senators and send you a Grant Award Notification (GAN); or we may send you an email containing a link to access an electronic version of your GAN. We may also notify you informally.

If your application is not evaluated or not selected for funding, we will notify you.

2. Administrative and National Policy Requirements: We identify administrative and national policy requirements in the application package and reference these and other requirements in the Applicable Regulations section of this notice.

We reference the regulations outlining the terms and conditions of an award in the Applicable Regulations section of this notice and include these and other specific conditions in the GAN. The GAN also incorporates your approved application as part of your binding commitments under the grant.

3. Reporting: (a) If you apply for a grant under this competition, you must ensure that you have in place the necessary processes and systems to comply with the reporting requirements in 2 CFR part 170 should you receive funding under the competition. This does not apply if you have an exception under 2 CFR 170.110(b).

(b) At the end of your project period, you must submit a final performance report, including financial information, as outlined in the P3 performance agreement. If you receive a multi-year award, you must submit an annual performance report that provides the most current performance and financial expenditure information as directed by the Secretary under 34 CFR 75.118. The Secretary may also require more frequent performance reports under 34 CFR 75.720(c). For specific requirements on reporting, please go to www.ed.gov/fund/grant/apply/appforms/appforms.html.

4. Performance Measures: Performance measures and interim indicators, along with required reporting, will be outlined in P3 performance agreements.

VII. Agency Contact

For Further Information Contact: Braden Goetz, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW., room 11141, PCP, Washington, DC 20202. Telephone: (202) 245-7405 or by e-mail: disconnectedyouth@ed.gov.

If you use a TDD or a TTY, call the FRS, toll free, at 1-800-877-8339.

VIII. Other Information

Accessible Format: Individuals with disabilities can obtain this document and a copy of the application package in an accessible format (e.g., braille, large print, audiotape, or compact disc) on request to the program contact person listed under For Further Information Contact in section VII of this notice.

Electronic Access to This Document: The official version of this document is the document published in the Federal Register. Free Internet access to the official edition of the Federal Register and the Code of Federal Regulations is available via the Federal Digital System at: www.gpo.gov/fdsys. At this site you can view this document, as well as all other documents of this Department published in the Federal Register, in text or Adobe Portable Document Format (PDF). To use PDF you must have Adobe Acrobat Reader, which is available free at the site.

You may also access documents of the Department published in the Federal Register by using the article search feature at: www.federalregister.gov. Specifically, through the advanced search feature at this site, you can limit your search to documents published by the Department.

Dated:

_____
Johan E. Uvin,
Acting Assistant Secretary for
Career, Technical, and Adult Education.

Appendices
Appendix A: Evaluation Commitment Form
Appendix B: Examples of Programs Potentially Eligible for Inclusion in Pilots

Appendix C: Competitive Preference Priorities 1 and 2 Evaluation Submission Requirements
Appendix D: Scoring Rubric

Appendix A: Evaluation Commitment Form
An authorized executive of the lead applicant and all other partners, including State, local, tribal, and non-governmental organizations that would be involved in the pilot's implementation, must sign this form and submit it as an attachment to the grant application. The form is not considered in the recommended application page limit.

Commitment to Participate in Required Evaluation Activities

As the lead applicant or a partner proposing to implement a Performance Partnership Pilot through a Federal grant, I/we agree to carry out the following activities, which are considered evaluation requirements applicable to all pilots:

Facilitate Data Collection: I/we understand that the award of this grant requires me/us to facilitate the collection and/or transmission of data for evaluation and performance monitoring purposes to the lead Federal agency and/or its national evaluator in accordance with applicable Federal, State, and local, and tribal laws, including privacy laws.

The type of data that will be collected includes, but is not limited to, the following:

• Demographic information, including participants' gender, race, age, school status, and employment status;
• Information on the services that participants receive; and
• Outcome measures and interim outcome indicators, linked at the individual level, which will be used to measure the effects of the pilots.

The lead Federal agency will provide more details to grantees on the data items required for performance and evaluation after grants have been awarded.

Participate in Evaluation: I/we understand that participation and full cooperation in the national evaluation of the Performance Partnership Pilot is a condition of this grant award. I/we understand that the national evaluation will include an implementation systems analysis and, for certain sites as appropriate, may also include an impact evaluation. My/our participation will include facilitating site visits and interviews; collaborating in study procedures, including random assignment, if necessary; and transmitting data that are needed for the evaluation of participants in the study sample, including those who may be in a control group.

Participate in Random Assignment: I/we agree that if our Performance Partnership Pilot or certain activities in the Pilot is selected for an impact evaluation as part of the national evaluation, it may be necessary to select participants for admission to Performance Partnership Pilot by a random lottery, using procedures established by the evaluator.

Secure Consent: I/we agree to include a consent form for, as appropriate, parents/guardians and students/participants in the application or enrollment packet for all youth in organizations implementing the Performance Partnership Pilot consistent with any Federal, State, local, and tribal laws that apply. The parental/participant consent forms will be collected prior to the

acceptance of participants into Performance Partnership Pilot and before sharing data with the evaluator for the purpose of evaluating the Performance Partnership Pilot.

SIGNATURES

Lead Applicant
Print Name _____
Signature _____
Organization _____ Date _____

Partner
Print Name _____
Signature _____
Organization _____ Date _____

Partner
Print Name _____
Signature _____
Organization _____ Date _____

Partner
Print Name _____
Signature _____
Organization _____ Date _____

Partner
Print Name _____
Signature _____
Organization _____ Date _____

Partner
Print Name _____
Signature _____
Organization _____ Date _____

Appendix B: Examples of Programs Potentially Eligible for Inclusion in Pilots

Programs that may be included in pilots are limited to those that target disconnected youth, or are designed to prevent youth from disconnecting from school or work, that provide education, training, employment, and other related social services. Programs that serve youth as well as other populations may still be eligible for inclusion. In general, the Agencies will consider whether the inclusion of a program in a pilot is consistent with, or conflicts with, other significant legal or policy considerations.

The Agencies recognize that for Performance Partnership Pilots to be successful they must protect vulnerable populations and individuals served by programs included in each pilot at the same time that funds are blended and pilots are given new flexibilities. For a program to be blended as part of a pilot, the Federal agency must determine that doing so will: (1) not deny or restrict an individual's eligibility to services; and (2) not adversely affect vulnerable populations that receive services from that program. More information on these determinations is provided in the FAQ section of the application package.

Some programs may introduce a greater likelihood of adversely affecting vulnerable populations, if blended in a pilot, and therefore warrant greater levels of review during the application process to ensure appropriate safeguards. Certain programs may be particularly well suited for blending if they have broad authority or a purpose well aligned with that of a Performance Partnership Pilot and therefore have very low risk of violating the P3 statutory protections. On the other hand, other programs may not be appropriate for a pilot at all if the Agencies determine that their inclusion would infringe on the statutory protections, or that inclusion would undermine important Federal policies or objectives. Where Federal programs are not eligible or suitable for blending under P3, pilots may consider how to braid funding streams, or align them in ways that promote more effective and efficient outcomes even though each stream of funds maintains a separate identity and remains subject to the requirements of the program for which the funds were appropriated.

To assist applicants in determining whether to propose various Federal programs for inclusion in a pilot using funds from FY 2014 and later years, the Agencies have identified three categories of risk as well as specific examples of the types of programs in each category. This resource identifies programs that should likely not be included in a pilot and those for which agencies believe that applicants would have either a notably high or low burden of proof to show that the statutory protections will not be violated. This is not a comprehensive list of all programs that may be involved in a pilot, and applicants should consider the context of their localities in determining which programs to blend.

In addition, the inclusion of FY 2014 competitive grants that have already been awarded will merit special consideration on a case-by-case basis to determine whether the scope, objectives, and target population(s) of the existing competitive grant award(s) appropriately and sufficiently align with, as well as enhance, the scope, objectives, and target population(s) of the proposed pilot.

Category 1: Programs with Low Likelihood of Adversely Affecting Vulnerable Populations

The Agencies have identified these programs as presenting a low likelihood of adversely affecting vulnerable populations if they are included in a pilot. The Agencies would require assurances, but not plans, for ensuring the protection of individuals and vulnerable populations in receiving services.

These programs may align with the purpose or requirements of Performance Partnership Pilots, or they may have sufficiently broad authority that blending those funds would be highly unlikely to violate the statutory protections.

Agency	Program
Corporation for National and Community Service	Americorps State Grants
Corporation for National and Community Service	Social Innovation Fund
Department of Education-- Office of Career, Technical and Adult Education	Adult Education and Family Literacy Act
Department of Education-- Office of Career, Technical and Adult Education	Career and Technical Education
Department of Education-- Office of Innovation and Improvement	Promise Neighborhoods
Institute of Museum and Library Services	National Leadership Grants for Museums/National Leadership Grants for Libraries
Department of Labor--Employment and Training Administration	Workforce Investment Act—Adult
Department of Labor--Employment and Training Administration	Workforce Investment Act—Youth
Department of Labor--Employment and Training Administration	YouthBuild
Department of Labor--Employment and Training Administration	Workforce Innovation Fund
Department of Labor--Employment and Training Administration	Workforce Investment Act Section 166 Indian and Native American Youth Program

Category 2: Programs Requiring Significant Review to Ensure that Vulnerable Populations Are Not Adversely Affected

The Agencies have identified these programs as potentially eligible for blending, but only with significant, robust safeguards in place to ensure that vulnerable populations are not adversely affected. While applicants should propose safeguards as needed, these safeguards would ultimately be negotiated and finalized through the performance agreement.
These programs typically serve highly vulnerable populations, such as homeless youth, foster youth, and students with disabilities. To blend funds from such programs, applicants must

convincingly demonstrate that the outcomes of the population served by the original program will not diminish during the pilot.

Evidence may include plans for data collection on the vulnerable population, alternative service options, and alternative sources of funds. A pilot's Performance Agreement will include outcome measurements and accountability mechanisms related to these vulnerable populations.

Agency	Program
Department of Health and Human Services--Administration for Children and Families	Adolescent Pregnancy Prevention Program (APPP)
Department of Health and Human Services--Administration for Children and Families	Basic Centers Program (BCP-Runaway and Homeless Youth)
Department of Health and Human Services--Administration for Children and Families	Chafee Education and Training Vouchers
Department of Health and Human Services--Administration for Children and Families	Street Outreach Program (SOP-Runaway and Homeless Youth)
Department of Health and Human Services –-Administration for Children and Families	Transitional Living Program (TLP-Runaway and Homeless Youth)
Department of Health and Human Services—Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration	"Now Is The Time" Healthy Transitions (HT): Improving Life Trajectories For Youth And Young Adults With, Or At Risk For, Serious Mental Health Conditions
Department of Health and Human Services—Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration	State Youth Treatment (SYT) Cooperative Agreements
Department of Labor--Employment and Training Administration	Reintegration of Ex-Offenders

Category 3: Programs Likely Inappropriate for Pilots Due to High Likelihood of Restricting Eligibility for Services or Adversely Affecting Vulnerable Populations

The Agencies have determined that any blending of funds from these programs would: (1) deny or restrict an individual's eligibility for services funded by these programs; or (2) adversely affect vulnerable populations that receive such services. These programs may entitle all eligible individuals to a service, or provide individuals with direct benefits such as vouchers, credits, and

scholarships. Applicants can try to justify that the blending of these programs' funds would not violate the P3 statutory protections. Such justifications must be compelling.

Agency	Program
Department of Health and Human Services-- Administration for Children and Families	Promoting Safe and Stable Families, title IV-B, subpart 2 (discretionary appropriations only)

Appendix C: Competitive Preference Priorities 1 and 2 Evaluation Submission Requirements

In order to be awarded any of the additional points under competitive preference priorities 1 and 2, applicants must include the following two documents as separate attachments to their applications:

1. A Summary Evaluation Plan that describes how the pilot or a component of the pilot (such as a discrete service-delivery strategy) will be rigorously evaluated. The evaluation plan may not exceed 8 pages. Our reviewers will be instructed to read only the first 8 pages of the plan. The plan must include the following:

• A brief description of the research question(s) proposed for study, and an explanation of its/their relevance, including how the proposed evaluation will build on the research evidence base for the project as described in Requirement 4 and how the evaluation findings will be used to improve program implementation.

• A description of the impact-study methodology, including the key outcome measures, the process for forming a comparison or control group, a justification for the target sample size and strategy for achieving it, and the approach to data collection (and sources) that minimizes both cost and potential attrition;

• A proposed evaluation timeline, including dates for submission of required interim and final reports; and

• A plan for selecting and procuring the services of a qualified independent evaluator[19] prior to enrolling participants (or a description of how one was selected if agreements have already been reached). The applicant must describe how it will ensure that the independent evaluator has the capacity and expertise to conduct the evaluation, including estimating the effort for the evaluator including the time, expertise, and analysis needed to successfully complete the proposed evaluation.

2. A supplementary Evaluation Budget Narrative, which is separate from the overall application budget narrative and provides a description of the costs associated with funding the proposed program evaluation component, and an explanation of its funding source—i.e., blended funding, start-up funding, or other funding (such as philanthropic). The budget must include a breakout of costs by evaluation activity (such as data collection and participant follow-up), and the applicant must describe a strategy for refining the budget after the services of an evaluator have been procured. There is no page limit for the Evaluation Budget Narrative. The applicant

---

[19] Qualified Independent Evaluator: A qualified independent evaluator is an individual who coordinates with the grantee and the lead Federal agency for the pilot, but works independently on the evaluation and has the capacity to carry out the evaluation, including, but not limited to: prior experience conducting evaluations of similar design (such as for random assignment evaluations, the evaluator will have successfully conducted a random assignment evaluation in the past); positive past performance on evaluations of a similar design, as evidenced by past performance reviews submitted from past clients directly to the awardee; lead staff with prior experience carrying out a similar evaluation; lead staff with minimum credential (such as a PhD plus 3 years of experience conducting evaluations of a similar nature, or a Master's degree plus 7 years of experience conducting evaluations of a similar nature); and adequate staff time to work on the evaluation.

must include travel costs for the independent evaluator to attend at least one in-person conference in Washington, DC during the period of evaluation. All costs included in this supplementary budget narrative must be reasonable and appropriate to the project timeline and deliverables.

In designing their evaluations, we encourage eligible applicants to be familiar with the criteria for well-implemented quasi-experimental and experimental studies as described in both the Department of Education's What Works Clearinghouse Procedures and Standards Handbook (see
http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/pdf/reference_resources/wwc_procedures_v3_0_standards_handbook.pdf) and the Department of Labor's new standards for its Clearinghouse for Labor Evaluation and Research (CLEAR) (see
http://clear.dol.gov/sites/default/files/CLEAR_EvidenceGuidelines_1.1_revised.pdf)
The Agencies will review the Summary Evaluation Plans and Evaluation Budget Narrative and provide feedback to applicants that receive competitive preference priority points and that are selected as pilot finalists or alternates. After award, these pilots must submit to the lead Federal agency a detailed evaluation plan of no more than 30 pages that relies heavily on the expertise of a qualified independent evaluator. The detailed evaluation plan must address the Agencies' feedback and expand on the Summary Evaluation Plan.

APPENDIX D – Scoring Rubric

Reviewers will assign points to an application for each selection sub-criterion, as well as for competitive preference priority 1 (Quasi-Experimental Site-Specific Evaluations) and competitive preference priority 2 (Experimental Site Specific Evaluations). The Department will assign points to competitive preference priority 3 (Promise Zones) if the application includes a letter from the lead organization of a designated Promise Zone describing the contribution of the applicant's proposed activities. To help promote consistency across and within the panels that will review P3 applications, the Department has created a scoring rubric for reviewers to aid them in scoring applications.

The scoring rubric below shows the maximum number of points that may be assigned to each criterion, sub-criterion, and the competitive preference priority.

	Sub-Criterion Points	Criterion Points
Selection Criteria		
A. Need for the Project The extent to which the applicant used a recent comprehensive needs assessment completed within the previous three years that draws on representative data on youth in the jurisdiction(s) to be served by the pilot that are disaggregated according to relevant demographic factors to (1) show disparities in outcomes among key sub-populations and (2) identify an appropriate target population of disconnected youth with a high level of need.	5	5
B. Need for Requested Waivers		10
(B)(1) The extent to which the applicant presents evidence that specific Federal barriers are hindering successful achievement of outcomes for the target population of disconnected youth identified by the applicant and cites the relevant statute, regulation, and/or administrative requirements for which it is seeking flexibility, including waivers.	5	
(B)(2) The extent to which the applicant provides a justification of how requested flexibility, including blending funds and other waivers, will reduce barriers, increase efficiency, support implementation of the pilot, and produce significantly better outcomes for the target population(s).	5	
C. Project Design		25
(C)(1) The extent to which the applicant presents a clear and logical plan that is likely to improve outcomes significantly for the target population by addressing the gaps and the disparities identified through the needs assessment, including the extent to which-- (a) The inputs and activities shown in the logic model are	10	

	Sub-Criterion Points	Criterion Points
necessary and sufficient to achieve the project's objectives, and (b) The assumptions of the logic model are identified and a rationale is provided for them. For example, applicants proposing job training or employment strategies should include data on the need for particular occupations in the relevant geographic areas.		
(C) (2) The extent to which the applicant demonstrates that the pilot will use evidence-based and evidence-informed interventions, in addition to systems change, as documented by citations to the relevant evidence.	5	
(C)(3) The extent to which the pilot will provide intensive, comprehensive, and sustained service pathways and coordinated approaches that are likely to improve outcomes significantly over the short, medium and long term by helping individuals progress seamlessly from one educational stepping stone to another, across work-based training and education, or through other relevant programmatic milestones to improve outcomes. For example, a pilot might prevent gaps in service that would jeopardize the achievement of outcomes by creating a seamless progression of services that provide continuous support as needed to the target population.	5	
(C)(4) For Federal programs that are proposed to provide funding for pilots, the extent to which the applicant explains how the use of funds for the pilot (a) will not result in denying or restricting the eligibility of individuals for services that (in whole or in part) are otherwise funded by these programs, and (b) based on the best available information, will not otherwise adversely affect vulnerable populations that are the recipients of those services. If the applicant proposes to include FY 2014 competitive grant funds that have already been awarded, the extent to which the applicant demonstrates that the scope, objectives, and target population(s) of the existing award align with the proposed pilot.	5	
D. Work Plan and Project Management		10

(D) The extent to which the applicant presents a strong work plan and project management approach that includes--
    (1) A detailed timeline and implementation milestones, including--
        (a) A statement of when any necessary preparatory work will be completed, which must be within 180 days of being awarded pilot start-up funding;
        (b) The expected start date of a project manager, the expected award dates of subgrants and contracts, and expected dates for establishing agreements among the partners;
	10	

	Sub-Criterion Points	Criterion Points

(c) The start date of the pilot services, such as participant intake and services;
 	
     (d) When the partnership will begin to implement pilot services or changes to administrative systems and policy and which partners are responsible for key tasks;
 	
     (e) The number of participants expected to be served under the pilot for each period, such as quarterly or annually (for example, number of participants enrolled, and the number achieving specified education, employment, and other outcomes); and
 	
     (f) For an applicant that is proposing an evaluation (as described in competitive preference priorities 1 and 2), when they will begin evaluation activities, including execution of a contract with an independent evaluator.
 	
  (2) A description of how the proposed budget and budget narrative align with the work plan, identifying how each implementation milestone will be adequately funded as outlined in the proposed budget; and
 	
   (3) A description of any existing or anticipated barriers to implementation and how they will be overcome.
 	
   (4) A description of the professional qualifications that will be required of the project manager and other key personnel are sufficient to ensure proper management of all grant activities, including timely reporting and the ability to manage a strategic partnership.		

E. Partnership Capacity		15
(E)(1) The extent to which the applicant demonstrates that it has an effective governance structure in which partners that are necessary to successfully implement the pilot are represented and partners have the necessary authority, resources, expertise and incentives to achieve the pilot's goals, resolve unforeseen issues, and sustain efforts to the extent possible after the project period ends, including by demonstrating the extent to which, and how, participating partners have successfully collaborated to improve outcomes for disconnected youth in the past. The proposed governance structure should reflect a plan for effective cooperation across levels of government, including a description of the State, local, and tribal roles in the partnership, or across entities within the same level of government to improve outcomes for disconnected youth, such as through coordinated program delivery, easier program navigation for participants, or identification and resolution of state and local policy barriers.	10	

	Sub-Criterion Points	Criterion Points
(E)(2) The extent to which the applicant demonstrates that its proposal was designed with input from all relevant stakeholders, including disconnected youth and other community partners. Where the project design includes job training strategies, the extent of employer input and engagement in the identification of skills and competencies needed by employers, the development of the curriculum, and the offering of work-based learning opportunities, including pre-apprenticeship and registered apprenticeship, will be considered.	5	
F. Data Capacity		30
(F)(1) The extent to which the applicant demonstrates the capacity to collect, analyze, and use data for decision-making, learning, continuous improvement, and accountability, and/or has a strong plan to bridge the gaps in its ability to do so, including the extent to which the applicant has, and will continue to: (a) Manage and maintain computerized administrative data systems to track program participants, services, and outcomes; (b) Execute data-sharing agreements with programs or organizations to share information with program partners and evaluators for case management, performance management, and evaluation purposes in accordance with Federal, State, local, and other privacy laws and requirements; (c) Use data to determine cost-effective strategies for improving outcomes; and (d) Regularly analyze program data to assess the pilot's progress, identify operational strengths and weaknesses and determine how implementation can be strengthened to improve outcomes.	5	
(F)(2) The strength of the applicant's plan to collect, store, manage and link data in ways that comply with all relevant Federal, State, and local privacy laws and regulations to ensure the protection of personally identifiable information.	5	
(F)(3) The extent to which the applicant shows how the outcomes of the proposed pilot will be a significant improvement compared with what might have occurred in its absence, both during the pilot project period and, for longer-term outcomes, beyond the project period.	10	
(F)(4) The extent to which proposed outcome measures and interim indicators, as well as their measurement methodologies and progress milestones, are appropriate and sufficient to gauge progress toward pilot objectives.	5	
(F)(5) The extent to which the data sources for the outcome measures and interim indicators will be accessible and independently audited or validated for accuracy.	5	

	Sub-Criterion Points	Criterion Points
G. Budget and Budget Narrative The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the project.	5	5
Total	100	100

Competitive Preference Priority 1: Quasi-Experimental Site-Specific Evaluations. Under this priority, competitive preference will be given to applicants that propose to conduct an independent evaluation of the impacts on disconnected youth of their overall program or specific components of their program using a quasi-experimental design. Proposals will be scored based on the clarity and feasibility of the proposed evaluation design and the applicants' demonstrated expertise in planning and conducting a quasi-experimental evaluation study.	5	5
Competitive Preference Priority 2: Experimental Site-Specific Evaluations. Under this priority, preference will be given to applicants that propose to conduct an independent evaluation of the impacts of their overall program or components of their programs on disconnected youth using a randomized controlled trial. Applicants' proposals will be scored based on the clarity and feasibility of the proposed evaluation design and the applicants' demonstrated expertise in planning and conducting experimental evaluation studies.	10	10
Competitive Preference Priority 3: Promise Zones This priority is for projects that are designed to serve and coordinate with a federally designated Promise Zone.	2	2

The reviewers will be asked to use the general ranges below as a guide when awarding points.

Maximum point value	Quality of applicant's response		
	Low	Medium	High
10	0-2	3-7	8-10
5	0-1	2-3	4-5

Program Statute

Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2014 (Public Law No: 113-76)

Sec. 526. (a) Definitions.--In this section,

(1) ``Performance Partnership Pilot'' (or ``Pilot'') is a project that seeks to identify, through a demonstration, cost- effective strategies for providing services at the State, regional, or local level that--

(A) involve two or more Federal programs (administered by   one or more Federal agencies)--

(i) which have related policy goals, and

(ii) at least one of which is administered (in whole or in part) by a State, local, or tribal government; and

(B) achieve better results for regions, communities, or   specific at-risk populations through making better use of the   budgetary resources that are available for supporting such programs.

(2) ``To improve outcomes for disconnected youth'' means to increase the rate at which individuals between the ages of 14 and 24 (who are low-income and either homeless, in foster care, involved in the juvenile justice system, unemployed, or not enrolled in or at risk of dropping out of an educational institution) achieve success in meeting educational, employment, or other key goals.

(3) The ``lead Federal administering agency'' is the Federal agency, to be designated by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget (from among the participating Federal agencies that have statutory responsibility for the Federal discretionary funds that will be used in a Performance Partnership Pilot), that will enter into and administer the particular Performance Partnership Agreement on behalf of that agency and the other participating Federal agencies.

(b) Use of Discretionary Funds in Fiscal Year 2014.--Federal agencies may use Federal discretionary funds that are made available in this Act to carry out up to 10 Performance Partnership Pilots. Such Pilots shall:

(1) be designed to improve outcomes for disconnected youth, and

(2) involve Federal programs targeted on disconnected youth, or designed to prevent youth from disconnecting from school or work, that provide education, training, employment, and other related social services.

(c) Performance Partnership Agreements.--Federal agencies may use Federal discretionary funds, as authorized in subsection (b), to participate in a Performance Partnership Pilot only in accordance with the terms of a Performance Partnership Agreement that--

(1) is entered into between--

(A) the head of the lead Federal administering agency, on behalf of all of the participating Federal agencies (subject to the head of the lead Federal administering agency having received from the heads of each of the other participating agencies their written concurrence for entering into the Agreement), and

(B) the respective representatives of all of the State, local, or tribal governments that are participating in the Agreement; and

(2) specifies, at a minimum, the following information:

(A) the length of the Agreement (which shall not extend beyond September 30, 2018);

(B) the Federal programs and federally funded services that are involved in the Pilot;

(C) the Federal discretionary funds that are being used in the Pilot (by the respective Federal account identifier, and the total amount from such account that is being used in the Pilot), and the period (or periods) of availability for obligation (by the Federal Government) of such funds;

(D) the non-Federal funds that are involved in the Pilot, by source (which may include private funds as well as governmental funds) and by amount;

(E) the State, local, or tribal programs that are involved in the Pilot;

(F) the populations to be served by the Pilot;

(G) the cost-effective Federal oversight procedures that will be used for the purpose of maintaining the necessary level of accountability for the use of the Federal discretionary funds;

(H) the cost-effective State, local, or tribal oversight procedures that will be used for the purpose of maintaining the necessary level of accountability for the use of the Federal discretionary funds;

(I) the outcome (or outcomes) that the Pilot is designed to achieve;

(J) the appropriate, reliable, and objective outcome-measurement methodology that the Federal Government and the participating State, local, or tribal governments will use, in carrying out the Pilot, to determine whether the Pilot is achieving, and has achieved, the specified outcomes that the Pilot is designed to achieve;

(K) the statutory, regulatory, or administrative requirements related to Federal mandatory programs that are barriers to achieving improved outcomes of the Pilot; and

(L) in cases where, during the course of the Pilot, it is determined that the Pilot is not achieving the specified outcomes that it is designed to achieve,

(i) the consequences that will result from such deficiencies with respect to the Federal discretionary funds that are being used in the Pilot, and

(ii) the corrective actions that will be taken in order to increase the likelihood that the Pilot, upon completion, will have achieved such specified outcomes.

(d) Agency Head Determinations.--A Federal agency may participate in a Performance Partnership Pilot (including by providing Federal discretionary funds that have been appropriated to such agency) only upon the written determination by the head of such agency that the agency's participation in such Pilot-_

(1) will not result in denying or restricting the eligibility of any individual for any of the services that (in whole or in part) are funded by the agency's programs and Federal discretionary funds that are involved in the Pilot, and

(2) based on the best available information, will not otherwise adversely affect vulnerable populations that are the recipients of such services.

In making this determination, the head of the agency may take into consideration the other Federal discretionary funds that will be used in the Pilot as well as any non-Federal funds (including from private sources as well as governmental sources) that will be used in the Pilot.

(e) Transfer Authority.--For the purpose of carrying out the Pilot in accordance with the Performance Partnership Agreement, and subject to the written approval of the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, the head of each participating Federal agency may transfer Federal discretionary funds that are being used in the Pilot to an account of the lead Federal administering agency that includes Federal discretionary funds that are being used in the Pilot. Subject to the waiver authority under subsection (f), such transferred funds shall remain available for the same purposes for which such funds were originally appropriated: Provided, That such transferred funds shall remain available for obligation by the Federal Government until the expiration of the period of availability for those Federal discretionary funds (which are being used in the Pilot) that have the longest period of availability, except that any such transferred funds shall not remain available beyond September 30, 2018.

(f) Waiver Authority.--In connection with a Federal agency's participation in a Performance Partnership Pilot, and subject to the other provisions of this section (including subsection (e)), the head of the Federal agency to which the Federal discretionary funds were appropriated may waive (in whole or in part) the application, solely to such discretionary funds that are being used in the Pilot, of any statutory, regulatory, or administrative requirement that such agency head--

(1) is otherwise authorized to waive (in accordance with the terms and conditions of such other authority), and

(2) is not otherwise authorized to waive, provided that in such case the agency head shall--

(A) not waive any requirement related to nondiscrimination, wage and labor standards, or allocation of funds to State and substate levels;

(B) issue a written determination, prior to granting the waiver, with respect to such discretionary funds that the granting of such waiver for purposes of the Pilot--

(i) is consistent with both--

(I) the statutory purposes of the Federal program for which such discretionary funds were appropriated, and

(II) the other provisions of this section, including the written determination by the agency head issued under subsection (d);

(ii) is necessary to achieve the outcomes of the Pilot as specified in the Performance Partnership Agreement, and is no broader in scope than is necessary to achieve such outcomes; and

(iii) will result in either--

(I) realizing efficiencies by simplifying reporting burdens or reducing administrative barriers with respect to such discretionary funds, or

(II) increasing the ability of individuals to obtain access to services that are provided by such discretionary funds; and

(C) provide at least 60 days advance written notice to the Committees on Appropriations and other committees of jurisdiction in the House of Representatives and the Senate.