

Transcript of Webinar

Performance Partnership Pilots for Disconnected Youth (P3)
Round 2 (FY 2015) Notice Inviting Applications Bidders Conference
Date: Monday, May 9, 2016

[SUMMARY]

PLEASE NOTE: Since this presentation was pre-recorded, there was not a live Q&A session; however, you can still submit questions. While registering for the webinar, registrants were able to submit questions about P3 or the current Notice Inviting Applications. We have used these queries to develop and post responses to the frequently asked questions (FAQs) page. If you have remaining questions after viewing the webinar recording, you are encouraged to email disconnectedyouth@ed.gov, so that we can provide answers, as appropriate. Additional information may be made available at a subsequent date, depending on the questions received. You will be able to find any new information on <http://youth.gov/P3>.

[SLIDE 1]

MICHELLE BOYD: Welcome to the Bidders Conference for the Round 2 Notice Inviting Applications for the Performance Partnership Pilots for Disconnected Youth or P3. We are excited that you are interested in P3 and able to join this webinar.

[SLIDE 2]

MICHELLE BOYD: My name is Michelle Boyd and I work for the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services and I will be moderating today's webinar. This webinar is being hosted by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services and youth dot gov on behalf of and in collaboration with the seven federal partners involved with P3 – specifically, the U.S. Departments of Education, Health and Human Services, Housing and Urban Development, Justice, and Labor as well as the Corporation for National and Community Service and the Institute of Museum and Library Services.

Today, you are going to hear from a few people at the partner departments and agencies, including representatives from the U.S. Departments of Education and Justice, the Corporation for National and Community Service, and the Institute of Museum and Library Services. During this webinar, they will explain P3 and the details of the Round 2 Notice Inviting Applications.

[SLIDE 3]

To begin, we wanted to share information presented by Johan Uvin, the Acting Assistant Secretary for the Office of Career, Technical and Adult Education at the U.S. Department of Education and Demetra Nightingale, the Chief Evaluation Officer at the U.S. Department of Labor.

During the Bidders Conference for the Round 1 Notice Inviting Applications, Johan and Demetra provided background and context for P3; we will re-play a portion of their remarks now.

[START: PLAYBACK FROM ROUND 1 (FY 2014) NIA BIDDERS CONFERENCE]

[SLIDE 4]

JOHAN UVIN: Thank you. And hello, everyone. President Obama has challenged us to restore the promise of opportunity for all. And for youth and many adults, this involves creating a clearer path to postsecondary education and careers, and thus building ladders of opportunity to the middle class.

Now, according to the Census Bureau, more than 5 million 14- to 24-year-olds in the United States are not on such a clear path to postsecondary education or training and a career. They are neither working nor in school. And in many cases, there is the additional challenge of being homeless, in foster care, or involved in the justice system.

Often disconnected from their families and valuable social networks, these young people struggle to make successful transitions to adulthood and to reach the educational and employment milestones critical to escaping a lifetime of poverty.

Practitioners, youth advocates and others on the front line of service delivery have told us about the significant challenges they face in improving outcomes for these youth. Some of these challenges include limited evidence of what actually works with this population, poor coordination and alignment of services across systems that serve these youth, policies that make it hard to target the neediest youth and overcome gaps in services, fragmented data systems that inhibit the flow of information, and many administrative requirements that impede holistic approaches to serving this population.

[SLIDE 5]

The Performance Partnership Pilots – or P3 – is one of several Obama administration initiatives that seek to address critical social challenges through community-driven, evidence-based strategies.

Complementary initiatives include: Promise Zones, which focused federal programs and resources intensely on hard-hit communities; job-driven training, which promotes improvements in education and training programs, emphasizing effective approaches that lead to in-demand jobs and that provide workers with pathways to good careers and incomes; federal innovation funds, including the Social Innovation Fund, the Workforce Innovation Fund and the Investing in Innovation Funds, all of which support projects that use and build evidence about how to effectively improve skills of at-risk youth; and finally, Pay for Success initiatives launched by the Departments of Justice and Labor and the Corporation for National and Community Service, which fostered partnerships to implement cost-effective services that improve outcomes while generating savings for taxpayers.

[SLIDE 6]

President Obama is also committed to strengthening the nation-to-nation relationship with Indian tribes, as well as strengthening broader tribal communities.

[SLIDE 7]

And with this as background, it is now my pleasure to turn it over to Demetra Nightingale, Chief Evaluation Officer at the Department of Labor, who will address the opportunity P3 represents from an evidence development perspective. Demetra?

DEMETRA NIGHTINGALE: Thank you, Johan. And welcome to all of you.

One of our objectives is to make sure that P3 builds the evidence about what works – what works for the disconnected youth populations. Again, the evidence agenda is a very high priority and a major emphasis of the Obama administration. And some of the creative approaches that will be allowed under P3 will add to what we know about what works.

So P3 is an exciting and unique opportunity not only to test the innovative, cost-effective strategies for improving results for the disconnected youth, but to build our evidence about effective practices and how to implement the practices and strategies developed to improve results.

The various federal agencies that are participating in P3 were all speaking to make sure that the pilots create a real strong foundation for broader change and continuous improvement of serving disconnected youth.

As we go through the slides today, we'll also be talking about how P3 will build into these opportunities for learning, both along the way as pilots are implemented but also from the results of some of the pilots.

A few of the opportunities we'll get back to in a few minutes. One is supporting the pilots that include, to the greatest extent possible, evidence-based and evidence-informed interventions and practices. Also, we'll have an emphasis on the grantees' and applicants' data capacity, such as their ability to collect data, to analyze data and use data for decision making, for learning and for continuous improvement.

There'll be also a national, federally-funded evaluation to help understand how P3 is implemented across the different pilots, and perhaps in a few of the pilots to test and experiment with some innovative approaches.

There will also be competitive preference points for applicants who propose to evaluate impact in their own pilots. And the federal partners will be setting up a community of practice for the finally selected pilots during the implementation.

These are just some of the examples of how all of the federal agencies here in Washington are working together to make sure that P3 follows through on its promise of accountability for outcomes but flexibility for service delivery and administration. And we want to create an environment where federal, state and local, tribal and nonprofit organizations are learning together and building the evidence about how we can best serve our young people.

[END: PLAYBACK FROM ROUND 1 (FY 2014) NIA BIDDERS CONFERENCE]

[SLIDE 8]

MICHELLE BOYD: We hope the background and context provided by Johan and Demetra was helpful for those who are both familiar with and new to P3. Now that we have covered those points, we wanted to go over the remaining topics for today's discussion. Specifically, we will go over the timeline, provide an overview of P3, and discuss eligibility, priorities, application requirements, selection criteria, and review and selection processes.

However, before turning it over to the remaining presenters to discuss these topics, we wanted to address how you can go about submitting questions. While registering for the webinar, you were able to submit questions about P3 or the current Notice Inviting Applications. We have posted responses to frequently asked questions or FAQs on youth dot gov slash P3. And when possible, we have included a reference to the relevant FAQ on the presentation slides. If there are remaining questions, we encourage you to email us at disconnected youth at ed dot gov, so that we can provide answers, as appropriate. Additional information may be made available at a subsequent date, depending on the questions we receive. You will be able to find any new information on youth dot gov slash P3.

[SLIDE 9]

MICHELLE BOYD: To cover the remaining topics, we are going to hear from Sanzanna Dean, Teri DeVoe, and Charndrea Leonard.

[SLIDE 10]

MICHELLE BOYD: First, we will turn it over to Sanzanna Dean from the U.S. Department of Justice to provide the timeline and overview of P3.

SANZANNA DEAN: Thank you. Hello, I'm Sanzanna Dean, a Senior Policy Advisor with the U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention within the Office of Justice Programs.

[SLIDE 11]

SANZANNA DEAN: As you may be aware, the P3 Round 2 Notice Inviting Applications was released on Tuesday, April 26. The deadline for the optional notice of intent to apply is Thursday, May 26, 2016. And the deadline for submitting applications is Monday, June 27, 2016.

[SLIDE 12]

SANZANNA DEAN: We hope you all have had a chance to review the current Notice Inviting Applications, since it provides detailed information about what we will briefly describe today.

As you heard at the beginning of the webinar, the purpose of P3 is to allow state, local, and tribal governments, in collaboration with their community partners, to test innovative and outcome-focused strategies to improve outcomes for disconnected youth. Specifically, pilots will do this by using new flexibility to blend existing federal funds from at least two youth-serving programs, and to seek waivers of program requirements from the programs that are involved. We can designate up to 10 pilots in the Round 2 competition.

[SLIDE 13]

SANZANNA DEAN: The term disconnected youth has been defined a number of different ways. Congress gave us a specific definition for the purposes of P3. For P3, disconnected youth includes individuals who are 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.

[SLIDE 14]

SANZANNA DEAN: Through P3 we are striving to improve outcomes for disconnected youth. According to the P3 statute, improving outcomes for disconnected youth means to increase the rate at which disconnected youth achieve success in meeting educational, employment, or other key goals.

One of the ways that P3 can support better outcomes is by enabling pilots to blend together funds from different youth-serving programs. Blending funds means that multiple funding streams or portions of multiple funding streams can be merged together into one pot.

Funds that are blended lose the identity that was associated with their specific original award. Instead, those blended funds together are subject to a single set of reporting and other requirements. The requirements for the blended funds will still be consistent with the underlying purposes of the original funding streams, even with the flexibility that may be offered.

For Round 2, applicants can propose to use funds from the partner agencies that were appropriated by Congress in Fiscal Years 2015 and 2016. However, only Fiscal Year 2016 funds from the U.S. Department of Justice's Office of Justice Programs are eligible to be blended as a part of Round 2 pilots.

[SLIDE 15]

To further explain, Round 2 applicants may not propose to blend or request any waiver of program requirements associated with Fiscal Year 2015 funds from the Department of Justice's

Office of Justice Programs in Round 2 pilots. However, they may propose to braid those funds in this round of pilots. Round 2 applicants may include (by blending, braiding, or requesting associated waivers of program requirements) Fiscal Year 2016 funds from Department of Justice's Office of Justice Programs.

And while U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development funds cannot be included in Round 2 pilots, they are eligible to be a part of the upcoming Round 3 pilots.

[SLIDE 16]

SANZANNA DEAN: Proposals from applicants should include at least two federally-funded programs that target disconnected youth, or are designed to help prevent youth from disconnecting by providing social services, including education and training, employment, or other services. Programs that serve youth and also other populations may still be eligible for inclusion – that is, the programs don't *only* have to serve youth to be eligible programs.

Of the programs that an applicant proposes to include in a pilot, at least one must be administered either completely or in part by a state, local, or a tribal government.

[SLIDE 17]

SANZANNA DEAN: For P3, waivers are an important tool to help achieve outcomes by gaining flexibility. P3 includes broad waiver authority that allows the heads of the participating federal agencies to waive anything that they can already waive under their existing authority; and also to waive any statutory or regulatory or administrative requirements that they are not otherwise authorized to waive, *but* in keeping with important safeguards.

These safeguards include that waivers have to (1) be consistent with the statutory purposes of their relevant federal programs; (2) necessary to achieve the pilot's outcomes, *but* no broader in scope than is necessary; and (3) able to result either in efficiencies by simplifying reporting burdens or reducing administrative barriers, or increased ability of individuals to obtain access to services that are provided under the relevant program.

[SLIDE 18]

SANZANNA DEAN: And then as additional safeguards, agencies cannot waive any requirements related to nondiscrimination, the wage and labor standards, or to allocations of funds to state and sub-state levels – meaning that the processes for distributing funds to states and below the state level cannot be changed.

In addition, federal agencies have to make determinations to ensure that individual eligibility and vulnerable populations are protected. In order to provide guidance on these determinations, the agencies have developed some responses to Frequently Asked Questions which can be found at [youth dot gov slash P3](http://youth.dot.gov/slash/P3). For instance, "Section C" of the Frequently Asked Questions addresses the use of waivers. This information may be helpful in describing how applicants can make sure that their proposals are consistent with these requirements.

[SLIDE 19]

SANZANNA DEAN: In general, the P3 program is designed to promote outcomes through a more flexible use of existing federal funding that already goes to communities.

To help facilitate the initial implementation of P3 pilot activities, the federal agencies are awarding start-up funding in this competition. Start-up grants may be used to support coordination and collaboration among a range of state, local, and tribal agencies, and other partners involved in the implementation process. Potential uses include planning, governance, technical assistance, evaluation, data collection, capacity building, and coordination activities. Up to 10 grants will be awarded for up to \$350,000 each.

[SLIDE 20]

SANZANNA DEAN: The statute also requires that each selected pilot be governed by a performance agreement between a lead federal agency and the respective representatives of all of the participating state, local, or tribal governments.

This could include multiple bureaus within a larger state, local, or tribal department coming together; multiple departments at a single level of government; or multiple agencies from across different levels of government that would all be included in the performance agreement and participate in the pilot activities.

The application package discusses all of the specific elements that are required for a performance agreement. But some examples of what needs to be included are: the federal funds and the programs that would be involved in the pilot, the population to be served, and the outcomes to be achieved.

That concludes our discussion of the timeline and overview. Thank you.

[SLIDE 21]

MICHELLE BOYD: Thank you, Sanzanna. We will now turn it over to Teri DeVoe to describe eligibility and priorities for the current competition.

[SLIDE 22]

TERI DEVOE: Thank you. I'm a Senior Program Officer at the Institute of Museum and Library Services.

[SLIDE 23]

TERI DEVOE: While the pilots can include many partners, there does need to be a single lead applicant. The lead applicant must be a state, local, or tribal government entity, represented by the head of that entity. In addition to formally submitting the application, the official

representative of the lead applicant will serve as the primary official who is responsible for the pilot project if selected.

Although a nonprofit organization may not serve as the lead applicant or the fiscal agents of the pilot implementation, it may still play a very significant role in the design and governance of a pilot.

[SLIDE 24]

TERI DEVOE: In addition to “Who are eligible applicants?” we are often asked “What are the programs that are eligible to be included in pilots?”

In general, the answer is discretionary programs, which include certain formula and competitive grants. Certain programs might be particularly well-suited for blending if they have broad authority or a purpose that is well aligned with that of P3, and therefore have a very low risk of violating the P3 statutory safeguards and protections.

On the other hand, other programs may not be appropriate for a pilot if the federal agencies determined that their inclusion would infringe on the statutory protections or that inclusion would undermine important federal policies or objectives.

To assist applicants, in the application instructions posted on Grants dot gov the Federal agencies have identified three categories of risk and provided some examples of programs that fall into each category. The three categories are: (1) programs that have a low likelihood of adversely affecting vulnerable populations; (2) programs requiring significant review to ensure that vulnerable populations are not adversely affected; and (3) programs that are likely inappropriate due to a high likelihood of adversely affecting vulnerable populations.

These lists are not comprehensive lists of all programs that could be involved in a pilot and applicants may consider programs that are not on the lists. Please note that Round 2 applicants must propose to use some Fiscal Year 2015 program funds.

In addition, the Fiscal Year 2015 and Fiscal Year 2016 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 populations of the existing competitive grant award are appropriately and sufficiently aligned with, and enhance the scope, objectives, and target populations of the proposed pilot.

The programs that are categorically not allowed by statute to be included are mandatory entitlement programs. This includes: Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, most of the foster care IV (four)-E program, and the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families.

Where federal programs are not eligible or suitable for blending under P3, pilots may still consider how to braid funding streams or align them in ways that might promote more efficiency and improved outcomes. With braiding, the funding streams would maintain a separate identity

and would remain subject to the requirements of each of the programs to which funds were appropriated.

[SLIDE 25]

TERI DEVOE: Now that I have discussed eligibility as it concerns applicants and programs, I am going to review priorities for the current competition. Since effective strategies for serving disconnected youth may differ across environments, the federal agencies want to test P3 authority in a variety of settings. Stakeholder input has emphasized that certain communities can face unique challenges in effectively serving disconnected youth.

[SLIDE 26]

TERI DEVOE: As a result, the current competition has the four absolute priorities shown here: improving outcomes for disconnected youth, doing so in rural communities, in tribal communities, and in communities that have recently experienced civil unrest. These absolute priorities constitute distinct funding categories.

[SLIDE 27]

TERI DEVOE: In selecting pilots, the agencies may consider high-ranking applications meeting absolute priority two, three, and four separately, to ensure that there is diversity among the pilots. Absolute priority one applies to applicants that propose to serve youth in communities that are not identified in the other three absolute priorities.

[SLIDE 28]

TERI DEVOE: Applicants may apply under priority two if they propose to serve disconnected youth in rural communities *only*. For the purposes of P3, rural communities can be identified based on whether they (1) are served by local education agencies eligible for either the U.S. Department of Education's Small Rural School Achievement program or the Rural and Low-Income School program; or (2) include only schools designated by the National Center for Education Statistics with a locale code of 42 or 43.

[SLIDE 29]:

TERI DEVOE: To apply under priority two, applicants should include a list of communities that they propose to serve and a list of the local education agencies serving those communities. A Local Education Agency or school does not need to be involved in a pilot in order to qualify for P3. The information is only to determine eligibility for absolute priority two. The Frequently Asked Questions provide more detail about how to provide the correct information.

[SLIDE 30]

TERI DEVOE: Applicants may apply under absolute priority three if they, (1) will serve disconnected youth in one or more Indian tribes that they clearly identify; and (2) represent a partnership that includes one or more Indian tribes.

[SLIDE 31]

TERI DEVOE: New to this competition, following the authorizing language, we are also including an absolute priority for communities that have experienced recent civil unrest. To apply under absolute priority four, an applicant should describe the instance or instances of civil unrest, including, (1) a description of the civil unrest that occurred in the community or communities it intends to serve; and (2) the date or dates the civil unrest occurred.

The current Notice Inviting Applications does not include a definition of the term “civil unrest.” However, the notice identifies several examples of what might be considered “civil unrest,” such as large protests or instances of civil disobedience, increases in self-directed or interpersonal violence in concentrated areas, or civic disorder prompted by a public health emergency.

[SLIDE 32]

TERI DEVOE: Now that I have reviewed the four absolute priorities, I want to tell you about the competitive preference priorities for this competition. These competitive preference priorities allow applicants to receive extra points for satisfying certain criteria.

[SLIDE 33]

TERI DEVOE: This competition has four competitive preference priorities.

This notice includes two new competitive preference priorities. Competitive Preference Priority 1 is for projects that: (1) serve disconnected youth who are neither employed nor enrolled in education and who face significant barriers to accessing education and employment; and (2) are likely to result in significantly better educational or employment outcomes for such youth. Applicants may receive five extra points for this priority.

Competitive Preference Priority 2 is for projects that provide all disconnected youth who will be served by the project with paid work-based learning opportunities. This priority offers applicants three extra points.

[SLIDE 34]

TERI DEVOE: Similar to the notice from the last or Round 1 competition, applicants may also receive two extra points under competitive preference priority number three if they propose projects that are designed to serve and coordinate with a federally designated Promise Zone.

[SLIDE 35]

TERI DEVOE: Applicants must provide a HUD Form 50153 (Certification of Consistency with Promise Zone Goals and Implementation) that has been signed by an authorized Promise Zone official. You can visit the website listed on the slide to see a listing of Promise Zones and their lead agencies.

[SLIDE 36]

TERI DEVOE: P3 provides an important opportunity for us to build knowledge about effective ways to serve disconnected youth. Therefore, our competitive preference priorities reflect the emphasis on learning through rigorous evaluation. This Round 2 notice includes a single competitive preference priority for projects that will support evaluations that use either a randomized controlled trial or a quasi-experimental design. As we did in the Round 1 notice, we require that the evaluator be independent of the entities involved in implementing the pilot.

Applications will be evaluated based on the quality of the proposed evaluation's design, the scale of the contribution the evaluation will make to the evidence base, and the applicant's expertise in planning and conducting comparable studies.

Due to the nature of this priority, we will provide additional information about what is required to qualify for the additional points. A starting place is to review the Frequently Asked Questions, specifically Section I (eye) on "Evaluation". We will follow up with additional information to provide an overview of evaluation and discuss what needs to be submitted by applicants to be considered under this priority – specifically, the evaluation plan and evaluation budget.

[SLIDE 37]

TERI DEVOE: We wanted to conclude this discussion on priorities by mentioning that the Round 2 notice includes two new invitational priorities. With these priorities, we are expressing our interest in applications that will improve outcomes for particular subpopulations of disconnected youth. However, applicants that meet these priorities will not be given an absolute or competitive preference over other applicants.

[SLIDE 38]

TERI DEVOE: Invitational Priority 1 is for projects that: (1) serve disconnected youth who are homeless; and (2) are likely to result in significantly better educational or employment outcomes for such youth. Invitational Priority 2 is for projects that: (1) serve disconnected youth who are involved in the justice system; and (2) are likely to result in significantly better educational or employment outcomes for such youth.

That concludes our discussion of the eligibility and priorities.

[SLIDE 39]

MICHELLE BOYD: Thank you, Teri. We will now turn it over to Charndrea Leonard to describe application requirements and selection criteria.

[SLIDE 40]

CHARNDREA LEONARD: Thank you. Hi my name is Charndrea Leonard and I'm a Senior Program Officer in the Office of AmeriCorps State and National at the Corporate for National and Community Service.

[SLIDE 41]

CHARNDREA LEONARD: Based on public input, we have taken steps to improve the competition and reduce burden on applicants, including concerning the application requirements and selection criteria.

Several of the application requirements from the Round 1 notice have been eliminated or streamlined in the current or Round 2 notice. Additionally, the Round 2 notice collects some of the information sought from applicants in table form in order to simplify how applicants provide these data.

We also streamlined and simplified the selection criteria in the Round 2 notice to reduce burden on applicants, as well as to focus on the factors that we consider to be the most critical in the successful implementation of pilots.

[SLIDE 42]

CHARNDREA LEONARD: We will first review the application requirements for P3. Applicants should respond to the application requirements and the related selection criteria in the application narrative. The application narrative must not exceed 45 pages total using the formatting standards listed in the application instructions.

[SLIDE 43]

CHARNDREA LEONARD: The first application requirement for this competition is an executive summary. The executive summary should briefly describe the proposed pilot, the flexibilities being sought, and the interventions or systems changes that would be implemented by the applicant and its partners.

[SLIDE 44]

CHARNDREA LEONARD: The next application requirement for this competition is a statement of need for a defined target population. The defined target population for this competition must be consistent with the populations identified in the law. As a reminder, for P3, disconnected youth includes individuals who are 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. Applicants should specify the target population(s) for the pilot, including the age range of youth who will be served and the estimated number of youth who will be served over the course of the pilot.

[SLIDE 45]

CHARNDREA LEONARD: The next application requirement is an identification of the federal flexibilities being sought, that are needed to implement the proposed pilot and to improve outcomes for the target populations. Applicants must describe the specific federal statutory, regulatory, or other requirements for which they are seeking flexibility.

As a reminder, the applicant must identify two or more discretionary Federal programs that will be included in the pilot, at least one of which must be administered (in whole or in part) by a State, local, or tribal government. The applicant must identify one or more program requirements that would inhibit implementation of the pilot and request that the requirements be waived in whole or in part.

Examples of potential waiver requests or other requests for flexibility include, but are not limited to: blending of funds, changes to eligibility requirements, allowable uses of funds, and performance reporting.

[SLIDE 46]

CHARNDREA LEONARD: Successful implementation of proposals may also depend on flexibility related to requirements imposed at the state, local, or tribal level. Federal agencies do not have the authority to waive non-federal requirements. Therefore, applicants must identify the specific state, local, or tribal policies, regulations, or other requirements that may impede the pilot's ability to achieve its goals.

We feel as if the federal and non-federal components of the pilots need to be aligned to support effective implementation of the pilot. Applicants then must provide written assurance that the state, local, or tribal government with authority to grant any needed non-federal flexibility has approved or will approve such flexibility within 60 days of an applicants' designation as a pilot finalist. Or the applicant needs to confirm that non-federal flexibility is not needed in order to successfully implement the pilot.

[SLIDE 47]

CHARNDREA LEONARD: The application requirements also include a graphic depiction of the pilot's logic model to illustrate the underlying theory of how the pilot's strategy will produce intended outcomes. It should not be longer than one page.

[SLIDE 48]

CHARNDREA LEONARD: Partnership capacity and management is the next application requirement. Applicants must identify the proposed partners, including any and all local and tribal entities, and non-governmental organizations that would be involved in implementation of the pilot.

As part of this requirement, applicants must provide assurance of the proposed partners' commitment, such as a memorandum of understanding – or MOU – or a letter of commitment. At a minimum, it should include a description of each proposed partners' commitment, including its contribution of financial or in-kind resources, if any.

[SLIDE 49]

CHARNDREA LEONARD: A description of the data and performance management capacity is also an application requirement. Applicants 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. For example, an education-related outcome measure could be high school graduation and an interim indicator could be high school enrollment.

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.

For each proposed outcome measure and interim indicator, the applicant must indicate the source of the data, the proposed frequency of collection, and the methodology used to collect the data.

[SLIDE 50]

CHARNDREA LEONARD: The last application requirement is the budget and budget narrative. For each Federal program, the applicant must provide (1) the grantee, (2) the amount of funds to be blended or braided, (3) the percentage of total program funding received by the grantee that the amount to be blended or braided represents, (4) the Federal fiscal year of the award, and (5) whether the grant has already been awarded.

In addition, the applicant must indicate the total amount of funds from all Federal programs that would be blended or braided under the pilot.

[SLIDE 51]

CHARNDREA LEONARD: Now I will turn to the seven selection criteria for the P3 applications, which are tied to the application requirements.

The points in the header of the slide are the total points available for that criterion, which may be broken out among sub criterion. Applicants can get a maximum of 100 points under the selection criteria, not including any applicable competitive preference priority points.

[SLIDE 52]

CHARNDREA LEONARD: Criterion A is the need for the project, worth five points.

The defined target population to be served must be based on data and analysis demonstrating the need for services within the relevant geographic area. The applicant's statement of need must present data that demonstrates how the target population lags behind other groups in achieving positive outcomes and the specific risk factors for this population.

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 jurisdictions proposing the pilot. We encourage applicants to disaggregate data according to relevant demographic factors. Applicants do not need to include a copy of the needs assessment within the application package, but must identify when the needs assessment was conducted.

Reviewers will consider the magnitude of the need of the target population, as evidenced by the applicant's analysis of data.

[SLIDE 53]

CHARNDREA LEONARD: Criterion B is the need for the requested flexibility, including blending of funds and other waivers, which includes two sub criteria both 10 points each for a total of 20 points.

Reviewers will consider:

(1) The strength and clarity of the applicant's justification that each of the specified Federal requirements for which the applicant is seeking flexibility hinders implementation of the proposed pilot, and

[SLIDE 54]

CHARNDREA LEONARD: (2) The strength and quality of the applicant's justification of how each request for flexibility will increase efficiency or access to services and produce significantly better outcomes for the target population(s).

[SLIDE 55]

CHARNDREA LEONARD: Criterion C is the project design, which includes three sub criteria and is worth 25 points total.

Under the first sub criterion, which is worth 10 points, reviewers will consider the strength and logic of the proposed project design in addressing the gaps and the disparities identified in the response to Selection Criterion (a) (Need for Project) and the barriers identified in the response to Selection Criterion (b) (Need for Requested Flexibility).

[SLIDE 56]

CHARNDREA LEONARD: Under the second sub criterion, which is worth 5 points, reviewers will consider the strength of the evidence supporting the pilot design and whether the applicant proposes the effective use of interventions based on evidence and evidence-informed interventions, as documented by citations to the relevant evidence that informed the applicant's design. Refer to the notice to see how interventions based on evidence and evidence-informed interventions are defined.

[SLIDE 57]

CHARNDREA LEONARD: For the third and last sub criterion, which is worth 5 points, reviewers will consider the strength of the applicant's evidence that the project design, including any protections and safeguards that will be established, ensures that the consequences or impacts of the changes from current practices in serving youth through the proposed funding stream:

- (1) 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
- (2) Based on the best available information, will not otherwise adversely affect vulnerable populations that are the recipients of those services

[SLIDE 58]

CHARNDREA LEONARD: Criterion D is the work plan and project management and is worth 10 points.

Reviewers will consider the strength and completeness of the work plan and project management approach and their likelihood of achieving the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, based on:

- (1) Clearly defined and appropriate responsibilities, timeliness, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks
- (2) The qualifications of project personnel to ensure proper management of all project activities
- (3) How any existing or anticipated barriers to implementation will be overcome

[SLIDE 59]

CHARNDREA LEONARD: Criterion E is partnership capacity, which has two sub criteria and is worth 15 points total. Input from the field has emphasized the importance of anchoring pilots in mature community partnerships that have demonstrated strong capacity to implement cross-system collaboration.

Building on this input, for the first sub criterion worth 10 points, reviewers will consider the extent to which a pilot has an effective governance structure in which, (1) partners that are necessary to successfully implement the pilot are represented; and (2) partners have the necessary authority, resources, expertise and incentives to achieve the pilot's goals and resolve unforeseen issues. This includes by demonstrating the extent to which, and how, participating partners have successfully collaborated to improve outcomes for disconnected youth in the past.

[SLIDE 60]

CHARNDREA LEONARD: For the second sub criterion worth 5 points, reviewers will also consider 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.

[SLIDE 61]

CHARNDREA LEONARD: Criterion F is data and performance management capacity, which has three sub criterion and is worth 25 points total.

For the first sub criterion, which is worth 10 points, reviewers will consider the applicant's capacity to collect, analyze, and use data for decision-making, learning, continuous improvement, and accountability, and the strength of the applicant's plan to bridge any gaps in its ability to do so. This capacity includes the extent to which the applicant and partner organizations have tracked and shared data about program participants, services, and outcomes, including the execution of data-sharing agreements that comport with Federal, State, and other privacy laws and requirements, and will continue to do so.

[SLIDE 62]

CHARNDREA LEONARD: For the two remaining sub criterion, worth 10 and 5 points, respectively, reviewers will consider:

- (1) How well the proposed outcome measures, interim indicators, and measurement methodologies specified appropriately and sufficiently gauge results achieved for the target population under the pilot, and
- (2) How well the data sources specified can be appropriately accessed and used to reliably measure the proposed outcome measures and interim indicators.

[SLIDE 63]

CHARNDREA LEONARD: The last sub criterion is Budget and Budget Narrative, which is worth 5 points.

Reviewers will consider the appropriateness of expenses within the budget with regards to cost and to implementing the pilot successfully. Reviewers will consider the entirety of funds the applicant will use to support its pilot including start-up grant funds, blended and braided funds, and non-Federal funds including in-kind contributions.

This concludes our discussion of the selection criteria. Concerning the selection criteria, we encourage applicants to consult the Frequently Asked Questions and application instructions.

[SLIDE 64]

MICHELLE BOYD: Thank you, Charndrea.

In addition to the application requirements and selection criteria, we wanted to highlight four program requirements that relate to the ongoing implementation of pilots once they are selected.

The first program requirement is to participate in any federally-sponsored P3 evaluation activity, including the national evaluation of P3. Applicants must agree to participate by submitting the evaluation commitment form that can be found in Appendix A of the application package.

The second program requirement is to participate in a community of practice that includes an annual in-person meeting of pilot sites and virtual peer-to-peer learning activities. This commitment also involves a pilot 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.

The third program requirement is to explain how the pilot will comply with applicable federal, state, local, and tribal privacy laws, such as by securing necessary consent from parents, guardians, students, or youth program participants to access data for their pilot and any evaluations. This is important because pilot partners may, for example, need to share data in order to support effective implementation, such as coordinating services and to conduct any site-specific evaluations.

The fourth program requirement is to enter into a performance agreement with a lead federal agency that will govern implementation.

[SLIDE 65]

MICHELLE BOYD: To conclude the details of the Round 2 competition, we want to provide an overview of the review and selection process.

[SLIDE 66]

MICHELLE BOYD: In collaboration with the partner agencies, the U.S. Department of Education is going to lead the review and selection process. We will work together to identify reviewers with knowledge and expertise on issues that are related to improving outcomes for disconnected youth. In addition, we will also identify reviewers who have expertise in evaluation to review Competitive Preference Priority 4, which is related to independent impact evaluations.

We will use a thorough screening process to prevent any potential conflicts of interest to ensure that we have a fair and competitive review.

Reviewers will be organized into panels. Each panel of reviewers will be assigned a number of applications to read. For each application, reviewers will prepare a written evaluation and assign a technical score using the selection criteria provided in the Round 2 Notice Inviting Applications.

[SLIDE 67]

MICHELLE BOYD: Reviewers will use a scoring rubric as a tool to promote consistency across and within the various review panels that will be scoring applications.

Per the selection criteria and related sub criteria, there is typically a maximum point value of either five or 10 points associated with a specific sub criterion. Based on the quality of the applicant's response, there is a range for a low-quality, medium-quality, and high-quality response.

[SLIDE 68]

MICHELLE BOYD: Once all of the applications have been scored, we will rank order them based on their scores. We will then conduct a review of the requested flexibilities, including waivers, in the top-scoring applications. Specifically, representatives from the federal agencies that administer the programs under which flexibility in the federal requirements is being sought will evaluate whether the flexibility that is being requested meets statutory requirements for P3 and is otherwise appropriate. As a reminder, applicants can consult Frequently Asked Questions, Section C about the conditions concerning waivers.

For example, if an applicant is seeking flexibility under programs that are administered by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services and the U.S. Department of Labor, then its requests for flexibility would be reviewed by officials from those two departments.

We may also ask applicants to participate in an interview during this review and selection process, in order to clarify any requests for flexibility and any other aspects of proposals.

[SLIDE 69]

MICHELLE BOYD: Federal agency officials may recommend the selection of up to 10 projects as P3 pilots.

In selecting pilots, the federal agencies may consider high-ranking applications that meet absolute priorities two, three, and four that pertain to rural communities, tribal communities, and communities that have recently experienced civil unrest, respectively. This is to support diversity among the selected pilots.

We will negotiate a performance agreement with each finalist. If a performance agreement cannot be settled, then an alternative applicant may be selected as a finalist, replacing the previous finalist.

[SLIDE 70]

MICHELLE BOYD: In conclusion, we want to reiterate how you can go about submitting questions. While registering for the webinar, you were able to submit questions about P3 or the current Notice Inviting Applications. We have posted responses to frequently asked questions or FAQs on youth dot gov slash P3. And when possible, we included a reference to the relevant FAQ on the presentation slides.

If there are remaining questions, we encourage you to email us at disconnected youth at ed dot gov, so that we can provide answers, as appropriate. Additional information may be made available at a subsequent date, depending on the questions we receive. You will be able to find any new information on youth dot gov slash P3.

In addition to visiting the program website at youth dot gov slash P3 for additional information, if you have any questions about the program after reviewing the application package and information on youth dot gov slash P3, please contact the program managers: Marilyn Fountain and Rosanne Andre.

[SLIDE 71]

MICHELLE BOYD: On behalf of the seven federal agency partners, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services and youth dot gov would like to thank you for joining today's webinar. Have a great day!

(END)