

Narratives

Executive Summary

CAPITAL AREA UNITED WAY

Capital Area United Way (CAUW) is an experienced grant-making institution with an 85 year history distributing funds to Baton Rouge area non-profit organizations. CAUW uses a rigorous, program-focused process to validate programs, select grantees, and support the replication and expansion of programs. 2011 grants totaled over \$6 million for over 100 programs in 46 agencies. This data-driven process based on demonstrated, measurable outcomes has led to new research-based methodologies.

We strive to achieve our mission "Helping People--Improving Communities" and create long-lasting change by addressing the causes of problems in education, income, and health--the building blocks for a better life. We identify necessary resource investments, apply them to a process of capacity-building within groups based on evidence-based programs, and evaluate outcomes to determine whether changes are making a difference to address current problems and reduce future needs. We engage a spectrum of partners that share this vision of change and will contribute social and economic capital to leverage our community-building.

As part of a 10-year commitment made July 2011 and based on research by the Minneapolis Federal Reserve, Nobel Prize-winning economist James Heckman, and others, we will launch a geographically-based SIF project serving low-income populations in the 10-parish Greater Baton Rouge area. With a Youth Development focus we will build community impact initiatives surrounding early childhood success and its link to the economic well-being of our rural and low-income parishes. CAUW will measure success for this project--children's school readiness--by examining indicators of improved birth outcomes; parents engaged, supported, and educated to meet the needs of their young children (including financial education); all children having access to quality child care and preschool; and children's physical health, safety, and social-emotional needs are met.

Narratives

Research proves that targeted early childhood investments impact not only future generations but also individuals' and families' current economic well-being, by attracting new investments and industry expansions.

CAUW will conduct an open and competitive RFP process, awarding 8-12 subgrants averaging between \$100,000 and \$250,000 annually. Subgrants will be awarded to replicate or expand early childhood development programs that are both known (such as Help Me Grow, Triple-P, NFP, diverse delivery, and mental health consultation) and new; subgrantees will demonstrate preliminary, moderate, or strong levels of evidence. We will be particularly attuned to programs which can be replicated in other regions, for extended impact. It is anticipated most subgrantees will demonstrate preliminary or moderate levels of evidence; they will receive support to improve their evidence base. Outcomes will be measured by examining the overall community impact through use of the EDI (Early Development Instrument).

While the sole applicant, CAUW will be supported by a team of contracted partners and collaborating entities, including the LSU/Tulane Early Childhood Policy and Data Center, UCLA, and our Impact Cabinet. Representatives from the LSU/Tulane Center; Impact Cabinet; experts from government, education, and non-profit sectors; investment volunteers; and other partners will assist in the subgrant review process and subgrantee selection and help provide continuing technical assistance and support to subgrantees. CAUW will also support subgrantees with centralized data collection and technology support; evaluation support; capacity-building technical assistance; and fundraising.

We are requesting \$1,000,000 a year for 5 years, beginning in October 2012. Federal funding will be matched by non-federal funds from area foundations and corporations. Knowing their commitment to preparing for students' success in school, productive work, and healthy and safe lives and to the "well-being of families and communities," we are confident in our ability to secure

Narratives

matching funds. We have provided documentation of our ability and the commitment from our Board to meet matching requirements for year 1 out of existing cash reserves, which are in excess of the required amount, if needed. Shortfalls of our match requirement in each of years 2-5 would be provided from unrestricted annual campaign funding (currently nearly \$10,000,000 per year), if necessary.

Program Design

2.a: GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Capital Area United Way (CAUW) is proposing a geographically-based Social Innovation Fund project, focused on Youth Development, within the 10 parishes (i.e., counties) of the Greater Baton Rouge Metropolitan Area: East Baton Rouge, West Baton Rouge, East Feliciana, West Feliciana, Pointe Coupee, Iberville, Livingston, Ascension, St. James, and St. Helena. Louisiana is a philanthropically-underserved area, in that it is ranked 43rd in per capita foundation giving in the country and ranked 50th in terms of foundation giving as a percentage of gross state product. The statistics also show that Louisiana, and our region in particular, face many challenges in education and economic opportunity. In our 10-parish area between 29.5% and 51.8% of people are low-income, living below 200% of the poverty level. Louisiana has ranked 49th or worse on the Annie E. Casey Kids Count Data Book for more than 20 consecutive years and ranks 47th in the nation in its public high school graduation rate, with only 59% of children in our largest catchment area, East Baton Rouge Parish, graduating high school. Louisiana's 4th grade students' reading scores are 50th in the nation according to the National Assessment of Education Progress. Also, 66% of Louisiana public school students are on free and reduced lunch, but 7 of the 10 parishes in our region have rates even higher than that, with St. Helena Parish (93%) being the worst .

Multiple studies show that the educational problem begins even before students enter school in kindergarten. For example, according to Early Childhood Risk in Louisiana, a report by the

Narratives

LSU/Tulane Early Childhood Policy and Data Center, there are approximately 310,716 children under age five in Louisiana. Based on four categories of risk, there are no children in Louisiana that live in parishes that scored in the Low Risk category. In fact, 230,417 of Louisiana's young children (74.2%) are growing up in Moderate-High or High Risk parishes (51 of the 64 parishes). In the CAUW 10-parish catchment area, 6 parishes scored in the Moderate-High Risk category (East Baton Rouge, East Feliciana, Iberville, Pointe Coupee, St. Helena, West Baton Rouge): there are approximately 36,722 children under age 5 living in these 6 parishes, or almost 12% of all children under age 5 in Louisiana.

In the largest parish, East Baton Rouge, approximately 15% of all live births are to adolescent parents, which accounts for over 800 babies each year. Indeed, all 10 parishes in the CAUW catchment area exceed the teen birth rate national average, with a range of 33% above the national average (East Baton Rouge) to 132% above (East Feliciana). These children, born to children, are at greater risk, too. When looking at broad indicators of child well-being--including infant mortality, low birth weight, teen births, maternal education and marital status--the parishes that comprise the CAUW catchment area significantly lag behind the national average, in many cases by more than two to one. Children who begin school behind typically remain behind, and research demonstrates that as many as half of school failures may be due to gaps in learning and development before school entry. Consequently, our project would target children 0-5 and their parents at the time in which the risk (for lack of school readiness and far-reaching economic well-being) originates.

Our choice to focus on Youth Development, particularly early development, is based also on research which shows that, while we need to continue to try to meet basic needs and fill gaps in the educational achievements of students in elementary, middle, and high schools and of adult learners as well, the way to make the greatest impact on the future economic and social well-being of our community is by improving education and development at the earliest stages. Research shows that a

Narratives

better educated community is healthier, has a higher earning potential, and is less likely to need help meeting their basic needs. Research has also shown that early learning and childhood development is as critical to economic infrastructure and development as good schools, roads, healthcare, and other factors, because most of the core structure of the brain develops in the first few years of life. A study recently published in *Pediatrics*, based on two decades of scientific research, notes that the way that this core structure develops can "permanently undermine" individuals, contributing to a higher likelihood of major health issues, such as heart disease, obesity, diabetes later in life...as well as struggles with school, the law, and relationships over the course of their lives. Child abuse and neglect, as expected, cause a particularly high level of the "toxic stress" that inhibits core brain development. In the Capital Area region over the past 10 years, the number of children entering foster care due to abuse and neglect under the age of 6 has increased 120 percent; this increase is even more dramatic for the youngest children, those under age 3, for whom the rate of entering foster care due to abuse has increased by 132 percent.

In the Quality Start system, Louisiana's quality rating and improvement system (QRIS) for licensed child care centers, the designation for "quality" begins at three stars. On the positive side, although it is voluntary, the number of centers (including Head Start and Early Head Start programs) participating in Quality Start continues to increase at a rapid pace. Less than five years after its inception, Quality Start now has 739 centers (almost 40% of all licensed centers) participating. However, as of March 1, 2012, of these participating centers, only 18.4% have achieved "quality." Specifically in the CAUW catchment area, there are a total of 369 licensed child care centers. Of these, 68.3% are not participating in the rating system while 18.2% have 1 star, 9.5% have 2 stars, 1.4% have 3 stars, 2.4% have 4 stars and 0.3% have 5 stars. These numbers lag behind the statewide trend.

More importantly, in our 10-parish catchment area there are 3,961 children who receive state

Narratives

subsidized child care from the state through the child care assistance program or foster care. Of this group, 41 percent are at centers that do not participate in the rating system and therefore have zero stars; 32 percent are at centers with 1 star; 18 percent at centers with 2 stars; and 4 percent each at centers with 3 stars and 4 stars. Only 6 of the almost 4,000 children are being served in centers with 5-star care. With so few of these children being served in quality settings, supporting agencies working to improve the quality of our childcare centers is one of the specific types of initiatives we hope to fund through a SIF subgrant.

When it comes to investment of funds, a return on investment (ROI) analysis done by Nobel Prize-winning economist James Heckman shows that the older the individual, the lower the rate of ROI in future education and development. In contrast the Federal Reserve Bank in Minneapolis has demonstrated that successful early learning programs can generate a 13% public rate of return, through a) reduced crime rates, teenage pregnancy, welfare dependency, job training costs, special education costs, and grade repetition and b) increased success in school, graduation rates, workforce readiness, job productivity, lifetime earnings, and community engagement. Heckman, too, notes that investments in early childhood pay dividends over the entire life of that child and concludes that "investing later [in an individual's life] chains us to fixing the missed opportunities of the past." Consequently, supporting early childhood learning and development is a smarter long-term public investment than supporting training and re-training for adults.

CAUW is in a unique and powerful position to leverage relationships with businesses, government, education systems, other funders, area non-profits and other stakeholders to create a quality, economically-driven collaborative dedicated to ensuring that every child, regardless of socioeconomic background, has equal access to both a healthy start in life and a secure future. In July we launched a 10-year commitment to early childhood development with the goal that "Children in the Capital Area will enter school ready to learn." We have established an Impact Cabinet,

Narratives

comprised of cross sector members from business, health care, and social services, who engage subject matter experts from government, higher education, and the non-profit sectors to help identify, investigate, and evaluate promising models and practices to follow. The Impact Cabinet has established the following intended outcomes of our 10-year commitment: improved birth outcomes; parents are engaged, supported, and educated to meet the needs of their young children; all children have access to quality child care and preschool; children's physical health and safety needs are met; and children's social-emotional needs are met.

The over arching measure of success, to indicate that children are entering school ready to learn, will be provided by use of the Early Development Instrument (EDI), a population measure of how young children are developing in communities. Other indicators could include the number of children attending quality childcare programs, children's performance on state kindergarten entrance tests, placement in special education, and promotion to first grade. Using the EDI, we will compare the school readiness of children who receive services from subgrantees with that of children who enter school who did not receive these supports. These data can be analyzed by the number of services received and the intensity and duration of these services. Indicators of youth success will come from the community non-profits who are our subgrantees, based on how the children who receive early childhood intervention perform in those subgrantee programs and whether those children better meet standard, developmentally-appropriate benchmarks. We are committed to providing all support necessary to those programs' success, because the success of our own public commitment is tied to the subgrantees' success.

2.b.i: SUBGRANTEE SELECTION

The Request for Proposals (RFP) for our subgrantees will be created by the SIF Program Director, in consultation with other supervising CAUW staff, our Impact Cabinet, and members of our evaluation team. The RFP will clearly describe the conditions for applying and will specifically

Narratives

detail the evidence-based requirement as well as the need for a theory of change and model, with either successful outcomes from other implementations or research which demonstrates the potential success of the program. We will also inform applicants we are looking for programs which can be expanded or replicated, for higher impact. We will request a letter of inquiry prior to application to help us determine whether a sufficient number of applications will be received or whether additional outreach is required. We are targeting between 8-12 subgrantees, with awards ranging from \$100,000 to \$250,000. We anticipate the RFP design phase to require up to one month and will begin immediately at time of award.

We will publicize the RFP in several ways. We will have the RFP announced and linked on our website and announced through social media. We will heavily promote the RFP by sending it to partner agencies we currently fund through our annual investment process and to agencies with which our Volunteer Center works. In addition, we will distribute the RFP to other local funders and to the subject matter experts our Impact Cabinet has engaged, for their distribution to their partner non-profits. Local media will be leveraged through press releases.

After the publication of the RFP, we will host several information sessions across our region. We will review the requirements of the RFP request, especially the evidence-based requirements, with experts from our review panel available to discuss in detail the types of evidence required. In addition to answering questions in person, we will subsequently post all questions and answers to our website, as FAQs. We anticipate the publication and information session phase to require two months (from publication of the RFP to final submission deadline).

Our review panel will be comprised of representatives of four different groups. First, we will include experts in early childhood learning and development. This group will be most knowledgeable about current practices in the community, recommended and promising evidence-based models, and research in the field. They will be able to help determine an approach's relevance, validity, potential,

Narratives

and scope. In addition, they will provide perspective on whether that approach is already prevalent in the community or is so commonplace that the solution does not meet the innovative nature of the Social Innovation Fund.

Second, we will include members of our evaluation team, from the LSU/Tulane Early Childhood Policy and Data Center, who are experts in statistical analysis and research methodology. A variety of solutions might be proposed by a potential subgrantee, which could seem to be innovative but could nonetheless have little rigorous evidence to back them up. These evaluators will ensure that the programs selected do not just sound promising but actually have the ability to achieve results as demonstrated by the strength of their theoretical models.

Third, we will incorporate representatives of local foundations and funders in selection. This will not only leverage the experience of these reviewers but also put the proposals in front of sponsors capable of providing the matching funds necessary for award to the subgrantees. Included within this group are staff and board members of CAUW. As one of the largest funders in the Greater Baton Rouge area, our Board of Directors could choose to provide separately sourced, non-SIF dollars to fund particularly promising programs proposed by subgrantees, which could be used to meet their match requirements.

Finally, we will include representatives of our community volunteer base. These experienced volunteers participate in our annual funding investment process, intensively reviewing the work of local non-profits and recommending funding based not only on community need but also the outcomes of a program. These volunteers, who come from a wide range of backgrounds and neighborhoods, serve as a critical voice for the community constituents we want subgrantees to serve.

We will use several criteria to evaluate the proposals. We will evaluate the strength of the program's theory of change, including research-based practices employed and evidence of the efficacy of the solution. We will evaluate the past history of the organization in implementing and developing

Narratives

rigorous, evidence-based programming; building strong community partnerships; successfully meeting the needs of community members; collecting and utilizing data for program improvement; and successfully managing financial and operational systems. We will evaluate the ability of the organization to scale and implement the proposed solution. We will evaluate whether the proposed solution is appropriate for our community, its population, and its most pressing needs. We will evaluate the alignment of the program with our overall objectives for community impact. Finally, we will evaluate the budget of the program and the ability of the organization to continue the program after the end of SIF funding. CAUW may be able to help meet this need for some subgrantees, as outstanding programs can be admitted to our annual funding process and receive CAUW support.

Our proposal evaluation process will be overseen by the SIF Program Director, other CAUW staff, a member of our contracted evaluation team, and a subcommittee of the Impact Cabinet, a group of advisors comprised of education experts and community and business leaders. We will begin with a qualifications review. CAUW staff will review all submitted applications to verify that all required information has been submitted and that applicants meet basic requirements, such as non-profit status and appropriate focus within youth development. Staff will also determine any conflicts of interest between applicants and potential reviewers and will direct applications appropriately to negate any conflicts.

All applications which pass the qualifications review will be assigned to reviewers from the full review panel. Each application will be reviewed by one representative of each of the four distinct groups outlined above. Reviewers will use an evaluation rubric with the following criteria and weights: Use of evidence/Model, 30%; Organizational Experience, 15%; Capacity to Administer Program, 15%; Potential Impact on School Readiness, 30%; Budget Adequacy and Fiscal Management, 10%. [Programs following the evidence-based models identified in the section 2bii will receive 5 bonus points.]

Narratives

Applications will be ordered based on the scores they receive. Then application budgets will be reviewed, starting with the highest scored applications. Should further information be required from applicants, it will be requested at this time. Reviewers will examine the reasonableness of the budget and determine appropriate levels of funding to each program. This will continue until all funds have been allocated. Prior to final decisions and award notifications, two or more members of the review team will conduct a site visit of the programs most likely to receive funding based on scoring and funds availability.

Should the highest scoring applications require higher levels of funding than \$100,000 to succeed, it will limit the number of final subgrantees selected. We will work to determine a reasonable subgrant amount that meets the needs of that organization's program, while still leaving our review panel sufficient funds to disburse to other promising programs. We will also examine the ability of the applicant to continue operations after the conclusion of Social Innovation Fund availability. We anticipate that our application review process will require two months, from the proposal submission deadline until subgrantee award. With one month for hiring a Project Director; one month for RFP development; two months for RFP distribution, information sessions, and submissions; and one month for application review and award; this will allow one month from time of award notifications for subgrantees to commence operations (or scale operations, as the case may be).

2.b.ii: PROPOSAL FOR EVALUATION

We hope to solicit proposals that are using already proven, evidence-based models or promising practices that are designed to directly impact our intended outcomes. Therefore, as mentioned above, bonus points will be awarded to submissions that propose to use any of the following program models:

Help Me Grow/early intervention and care coordination; Triple P (Positive Parenting Program)/parenting education; Nurse-Family Partnership/home visiting; building and supporting quality child care through efforts to create diverse delivery of early education services and/or

Narratives

providing mental health consultation to early education providers. We seek to fund models such as these because they serve the economic well-being of families, by helping them access high quality services that address one or more of their needs and thereby allows them to work or attend school.

* Help Me Grow (HMG) is an innovative, nationally-recognized best practice program that builds on existing resources and has already been replicated in 13 states. The HMG model is a comprehensive and integrated system for early identification of at-risk children and linkage to developmental and behavioral services/supports. HMG identifies these children through physician and other community outreach and through detailed assessments and connects children and their parents to critical resources to address those problems. The four core components of the HMG system are 1) centralized telephone access point for connection of children and their families to services and care coordination; 2) community outreach to promote the use of HMG and to provide networking opportunities among families, service providers, and other professionals (including child health care, early care and education, and family support providers); 3) child health care provider outreach to support early detection and early intervention; 4) data collection and analysis to understand all aspects of the HMG system, including the identification of gaps and barriers. This final step ensures continuous improvement of the quality of the program and its services.

* Triple P, or Positive Parenting Program, is a comprehensive system of parenting and family support backed by over 30 years of clinically-proven, worldwide research. Triple P's unique design offers five intervention levels of increasing intensity and narrowing population reach. The system was designed to enhance parental competence and to prevent or alter dysfunctional parenting practices, thereby reducing an important set of family risk factors both for child maltreatment and for children's behavioral and emotional problems. Triple P is now used in 20 countries across North America, Europe, Australia and Asia. Triple P has been shown to reduce the prevalence of conduct and emotional problems in preschool-aged children from high-risk neighborhoods and to reduce coercive

Narratives

parenting practices. A recently published study, the United States Triple P System Trial, funded by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, found lower rates of substantiated abuse cases, child out-of-home placements, and reductions in hospitalizations and emergency room visits for child injuries in nine study counties in South Carolina where the Triple P parenting interventions were implemented.

* Nurse-Family Partnership (NFP) is a home visiting program that serves first-time mothers who are below 200% of the poverty level, beginning in pregnancy and continuing until the baby reaches two years of age. NFP has been rigorously evaluated using randomized controlled trials, the highest level of program evaluation. An independent cost benefit analysis by the RAND Corporation found that the NFP recoups its initial cost by the time the child reaches age four and that cost savings by the time the child reaches age 15 are estimated to be four times the original investment. Similarly, in a 2008 study by the Washington State Institute for Public Policy, the net benefits per child served by NFP were \$17,000. In Louisiana, NFP currently provides services in 52 of the state's 64 parishes, yet only reaches 15% of the potential eligible population.

* Building high quality early childhood education, including child care and Pre-K, is one of the most effective ways to improve school performance, increase high school graduation rates, and enhance job performance and adult productivity. One barrier to advancing high quality early care and education in Louisiana has been the lack of diverse delivery of public Pre-K. Although nationally over one-third of public Pre-K is provided in community settings, in Louisiana less than 1% of publicly funded Pre-K classes are located on non-public school sites. CAUW wants to nurture and encourage diverse delivery of public Pre-K whereby publicly funded Pre-K would be offered in community settings, including child care centers and/or Head Start programs. A diverse delivery model is considered best practice across the country, as it provides parents more high quality choices in their local communities, avoids the costs of building new school buildings as Pre-K expands, and promotes quality and accountability across early childhood settings. By promoting diverse delivery in Louisiana, CAUW seeks to develop a

Narratives

seamless early education system of coordinated programs across departments that will result in greater educational benefits and improved quality care for all children, as well as future cost savings to the state.

* Mental health consultation to early education providers would assist child care centers in improving the quality of care that they provide. Consultations range from assisting teachers in managing challenging behaviors, to creating supportive environments for children, to assisting providers to work more effectively with families. The consultants work at no cost to the center for six months, spending a day in the center every other week. In order to receive this service, centers must be participating in the Quality Start rating system mentioned earlier.

CAUW will be contracting with the LSU/Tulane Early Childhood Policy and Data Center to serve as our evaluation partner for the SIF project. This partner will also direct the overarching evaluation of CAUW's 10-year early childhood development campaign, and specifically the outcomes of this SIF proposal, through the Early Development Instrument, or EDI. The EDI is a population-based measure of school readiness that provides the capacity to measure, map, and track children's early outcomes down to a community/neighborhood level. Mapping these early childhood outcomes will provide community leaders a valuable tool that will help inform policy and target resources. The EDI has been implemented widely in Canada and Australia, as well as in 20 communities across the country by the Center for Healthier Children, Families and Communities at the University of California at Los Angeles (UCLA).

The EDI is a 104-item questionnaire completed by kindergarten teachers on each child in their class in the spring of the school year. The EDI measures five areas, or domains, of early childhood development: physical health and well-being; social competence; emotional maturity; language and cognitive development; and communication skills and general knowledge. The EDI identifies the percentage of children who are developmentally vulnerable by developmental domain and compares

Narratives

this information across communities (e.g., by county, city, school catchment area, zip codes, neighborhoods, census tracts, etc.). No data is ever reported on individual children or teachers. Rather, the EDI reports provide data about how the children are doing developmentally compared to children in other local communities.

The EDI results allow community members and leaders to compare the strengths and weaknesses in children's development and school readiness across communities and EDI domains; understand the relationship between children's EDI results and other important factors that may influence their health and well-being (e.g. resident mobility and the availability of community assets like preschools, family support providers, and health providers); motivate action and advocacy efforts to help children reach their potential; plan interventions and resource investments; and track progress over time to see how changes in investments, policies, or other factors influence children's health and well-being.

The EDI is also a scientifically-sound comprehensive tool. The EDI has strong predictive validity, allowing state education leaders to project more effectively which populations of students in which schools and communities are most at-risk of academic failure. This predictive validity thus allows state and local education agencies to develop supports and services in early elementary for whole populations of students within a school or a community and informs professional development needs of teachers and principals, thereby improving both teacher and principal effectiveness and student success.

Used in this way, the EDI supports a community-driven approach to improving school readiness. Data can be used to target resources and strategies to schools and communities with high vulnerability, to close the achievement gap. In particular, the early childhood community can use data to better inform their activities and address the school readiness gap birth to 5, creating a linkage from early childhood to K-12. This linkage allows for an increased community wide-understanding of

Narratives

the cumulative impact of early childhood experiences, including the various social and environmental factors that impact early childhood development, consequently fostering greater community-level accountability

While no baseline data exists as the EDI is not currently being used, data collection will begin in January 2013. As our subgrantees will just be initiating their programs then, this 2013 data will ultimately represent the baseline from which we can measure our progress.

Section 2biii ("Proposal for Growing Subgrantee Impact") describes the activities the SIF Program Director, other CAUW staff, and our evaluators will do to assess need for and provide technical assistance to subgrantees. Section 4 ("Cost Effectiveness and Budget Adequacy") explains the cost of our proposed contracted evaluation activities. With consultation by the LSU/Tulane Early Childhood Policy and Data Center, CAUW will be hiring a full-time EDI project manager, to coordinate with the schools and teachers for the project, send a letter to parents, conduct teacher orientation sessions, and coordinate the teacher compensation component. The LSU/Tulane Early Childhood Policy and Data Center will partner with the Center for Healthier Children, Families and Communities at UCLA as they are leading the implementation of the EDI throughout the United States (they are currently in over 20 communities). The LSU/Tulane/UCLA collaboration will generate quarterly reports for distribution to CAUW, its Impact Cabinet, its Board of Directors, SIF project subgrantees, and CNCS.

2.b.iii: PROPOSAL FOR GROWING SUBGRANTEE IMPACT

As with our program investment process, CAUW will assess subgrantee applicants' capacity for growth by looking to ensure that all selected subgrantee organizations exhibit the following characteristics: sound mission and alignment of mission with programs and services; active, engaged, and well-governed Board of Directors; financial health, through proper financial documents, sufficient revenues to support the work of the organization, and a budget that reflects the organization mission,

Narratives

including through the programs, services, and activities supported; programs and services have real and intended, measurable, and beneficial results; trust of the organization by the community; a track record of accountability; and evidence of collaboration with other community partners.

Both through our program investment and our Volunteer Center, CAUW has partnered with, supported, and engaged in capacity-building with dozens of area non-profits for decades. We have identified and brought to our region experts to train our agency leaders in topics of importance to their work and ours. For example, we have hosted trainings led by renowned speakers such as Ken Fyfe to discuss the importance and design of measurable outcomes and Martin Cowling to discuss maximizing volunteer potential. CAUW has also supported our partner agencies' development through leadership mentoring, marketing support, and targeted financial investments in the agencies.

Through the RFP information sessions we will hold, our incorporation of subgrantees into the development of the evaluation process, and regularly reiterated requests to subgrantees to ask questions and request technical assistance as needed, CAUW will establish a strong relationship with subgrantees that encourages clarity. In addition to subgrantees' own specific requests, CAUW will determine how best to support SIF subgrantee growth with technical assistance through our observations and assessments when monitoring subgrantees. This monitoring of subgrantees, to enable and ensure program growth and impact, will encompass four different areas.

First, the SIF Program Director will maintain regular contact and provide continuous monitoring of each subgrantee's program development. The Program Director will ensure timely startup, adherence to the subgrantee's own proposed program timeline and tasks, and CAUW and SIF project reporting. In addition, the Program Director will verify that the data collection processes developed by our evaluation team are in place.

Second, CAUW will engage in financial monitoring of subgrantees. A member of CAUW's finance staff will make semi-annual visits to perform spot-checks of financial management processes

Narratives

and documentation. An end-of-year audit will be conducted by our independent audit firm, in compliance with federally mandated audit requirements.

Third, it is likely that subgrantees will have made differential investments in evaluation efforts in the past, and may not be able to change, or are not interested in changing them. However, we are confident that a consensus for a initiative-wide evaluation approach can be forged by involving all the subgrantees in the design and interpretation of the evaluation data, providing joint and individual technical assistance, and offering flexibility in the selection of indicators and data submission methods. We believe this approach will produce concrete measurable outcomes for each subgrantee.

Using a participatory approach, we will implement an input/decision-making process that provides opportunities for all the stakeholders to give input, while allowing the evaluation to move forward at the pace necessary to capture the desired information and generate the required products on time. Given that the funded programs are not known in advance and in keeping with our theoretical belief that evaluation should be a participatory process to the extent possible, we suggest developing two different sets of indicators: core and optional. During the first 3-9 months of funding we propose to initiate and complete a process that will engage the subgrantees in developing indicators for the initiative. Core or common indicators will focus on specific outcome measures meaningful to all subgrantees (e.g., school readiness, economic well-being). A set of elective indicators will be used by sites focusing on specific outcomes relevant to their situation. These elective indicators can be aggregated across the sites that utilize them; while there will be less data for these indicators, they will represent meaningful outcome measures and benefit the individual sites by providing contextually-meaningful information.

The proposed indicators will be reviewed semi-annually by the LSU/Tulane/UCLA collaboration and will be revised as necessary, based on their utility and the evolution of the SIF initiative. However, the core indicators will remain constant to provide consistent data over time. Creating as

Narratives

complete a plan of the indicator system as possible, even if sites cannot implement it from the start, is important to help all subgrantees move in a similar direction. Still, we realize that the indicator system is new and that the evaluation team will need to be responsive to feedback to adapt the system appropriately. As part of the subgrantee application process, the RFP will explicitly state that funding is contingent upon the applying entity agreeing to participate in the evaluation and capacity-building process.

This process is based on a similar evaluation protocol utilized by UCLA in the statewide evaluation of school readiness in California, which was funded by First 5 California and which worked extremely well. Similar to our SIF proposal, the First 5 California initiative involved multiple sites that differ markedly in their specific service strategies and in their capacity for evaluation. In order to create a set of "core" and "elective" indicators, it was essential to recognize that significant work had already gone into creating an evaluation framework at individual sites; to provide adequate time for the process to unfold; and to provide the stakeholders with suggested indicators, including from the other funded sites. This approach established respect between the sites and the evaluators. This approach of creating "core" as well as "elective" indicators also worked well in a county-wide evaluation in Los Angeles conducted by UCLA, focused on evaluating the largest child welfare agency in the United States and the agencies they fund to provide services.

Finally, our community volunteers will also visit each subgrantee at least annually to examine their success in solving our community's most pressing issues. These volunteers, experienced from our annual investment process, will not only serve as a community voice but also help to prepare outstanding programs for potential inclusion in our annual investment process, both during their time as a Social Innovation Fund subgrantee and after.

Our evaluators from the LSU/Tulane Early Childhood Policy and Data Center will monthly review reports from each subgrantee regarding adherence to the data collection protocol, data

Narratives

analysis, outcomes, indicator measurements and developing evidence base. Based on these reviews, the evaluators will suggest or develop training sessions to be delivered at the next quarterly subgrantee meeting. The evaluators will make semi-annual visits to each subgrantee to review their procedures, make suggestions to their internal operations (as they relate to program evaluation), provide individual mentoring based on the development plan designed for each subgrantee, and make necessary additions/adjustments to development plans for each individual subgrantee.

As part of our Social Innovation Fund program, the SIF Program Director will hold quarterly technical assistance meetings with our selected subgrantees. Monthly check-ins by the Program Director will help determine topics for these quarterly training sessions. The topics will be centered around the current issues and phases of the programs, including discussions on data management, data analysis, fiscal management, etc. We will also incorporate into these meetings, at least semi-annually, time for each subgrantee to present on their program and to speak on areas of expertise for their organization; as they help to provide oversight of CAUW's early childhood initiative, Impact Cabinet members will be invited to attend those semi-annual presentations. These presentations will spark knowledge-sharing and collaboration among the subgrantees, which will lead to partnerships that not only strengthen the work of each agency but leverage resources and extend beyond the scope and timeline of the Social Innovation Fund. This is based on our successful Council of Agency Executives model, implemented among our current partner agencies, which meets to discuss industry trends and learn from outside subject matter experts. Annually CAUW will also host a public presentation day at which current and potential donors, community organizations, area subject matter experts, government, and others--from both the local area and from around the state--can learn about the subgrantees' evidence-based models and outcomes.

We will support subgrantees in locating matching funds. As mentioned earlier, our first step will be to include representatives of local foundations in our review panel. By participating in the review

Narratives

panel, our local funders will be exposed to the evidence-based solutions in our community and will be attracted to the opportunity to leverage their funding by matching the Social Innovation Fund. We will also incorporate an initial presentation day, following the announcement of the subgrant awardees, in which each winning subgrantee will present on their program and evidence. We will invite all local foundations, all our major corporate donors, and other community leaders to attend these presentations. In addition, agency programs that are currently funded by CAUW will be able to leverage our existing contribution as a match. We will also directly request additional funding beyond our own required match from our potential match sources, to support the match requirements of our subgrantees.

In these ways, over the next five years CAUW will work towards implementing evidence-based interventions and programs as well as supporting community-based providers in establishing other efforts as evidenced-based. The goal of these efforts is to develop, maintain, and strengthen programs and partnerships to enhance children's ability to enter school ready.

Organizational Capability

3.a: HISTORY OF COMPETITIVE GRANTMAKING

CAUW is an experienced grant-making institution with an 85 year history of distributing funds to Baton Rouge area non-profit community organizations. In 2011-12, as in the previous 3 funding cycles, CAUW is using a rigorous, program-focused investment process to distribute grants totaling over \$6 million, reflecting an investment in over 100 programs through 46 local non-profit agencies. This data-driven process bases funding decisions on demonstrated, measurable outcomes for each program and has led to investments in new research-based program methodologies. Moreover, this rigorous process has been continuously refined over the past 4 years, based on feedback from key stakeholders such as funding recipients and community leaders.

Many of these agencies have been funded partners of CAUW for decades. While our investment

Narratives

process has changed over the years, culminating in our current process which leverages data-driven investment decisions, our commitment to maintaining strong partnerships in our community has never wavered. We are seeking subgrantees who will become partners--funded and non-funded--of CAUW long past the conclusion of the Social Innovation Fund.

Please see sections 3b ("Experience Growing Program Impact"), 3c ("Evaluation Experience"), 3d ("Ability to Provide Program Support and Oversight"), and 3e ("Ability to Provide Financial Support and Oversight") for more information on our competitive award process and our staff's, contractors', and other expertise. With our extensive experience with funding awards, existing staff members, experienced volunteer base, the staff we would hire with SIF funding, our already-contracted evaluators, and our Impact Cabinet, CAUW has the capacity to undertake the subgrantee selection process.

3.b: EXPERIENCE GROWING PROGRAM IMPACT

After the hurricanes Katrina and Rita in 2005, CAUW intensified its focus on outcome-driven models rather than general support of agencies. With over \$3 million in disaster funds from federal, foundation-matching, and donor sources, CAUW was poised to drive improvements in the programs of grantees and subgrantees. One of the best examples that came out of that disaster response was from Catholic Charities of the Diocese of Baton Rouge (CCDBR). According to CCDBR, CAUW's "demands for accountability and results changed the way [CCDBR did] business, starting with post-Katrina dollars." CCDBR created a new disaster response model that focused on case management rather than simply handing out money post-disaster. As a result, Catholic Charities USA (CCUSA) embraced this approach, and CCUSA became the largest provider in the first federally-funded case management program. In 2008 when Hurricane Gustav hit Baton Rouge, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services/Administration for Children and Families (DHHS/ACF) partnered with CCUSA/CCDBR to implement their case management model in this region, and CAUW gave

Narratives

\$100,000 to fund this pilot. This program was so successful that, in July 2009, DHHS/ACF awarded CCUSA with a contract to provide case management response services through the USA and its territories following any disaster, and the National Commission on Children and Disaster cites the program initiated with CCDBR and funded by CAUW as a resource.

In 2007, following this shift in disaster funds management, CAUW began applying the same approach to non-disaster funding, transitioning to a funding model that focused on data-driven results and community impact. The first step was to strengthen the program funding model into one that not only measures and rewards return on investment, but also encourages capacity-building. Looking to integrate the lessons learned post-disaster, CAUW staff, member agencies, and community volunteers reviewed service delivery, operations and financial concerns, and outcomes measurements, then developed a set of criteria to use in annual program review. Since this criterion was established in 2008, we have used a nine-month in-depth selection and review process for all of our grantees. Each year we train approximately 160 community volunteers, many of whom are from the banking, engineering, education, and other business-related fields. Their background in business strategies and practices, coupled with our outcomes training, provides the basis for our program monitoring and outcomes review process.

The key to the effectiveness of our funding model is the support that we provide to the agencies throughout the process. CAUW looks not only to validate effectiveness but also to drive better outcomes by giving the agencies the tools that they need to increase the capacity of their programs. From 2009-2010 CAUW piloted a software tool (Andar) to help measure and report outcomes and ROI. The pilot included a representative sample of funded agencies and included a feedback loop to better the software launch process. This launch was successfully completed for all programs that sought funding consideration in the funding cycle.

Agencies that apply for program funding are given training on outcomes, such as data collection,

Narratives

indicator measurements, and logic models. CAUW staff also provide a series of one-on-one support meetings with the agencies to go over expectations, answer any questions, and provide extensive on-site training in use of the evaluation and reporting software tool, using real examples from the agency. By using program-specific data in these individualized trainings, we encourage the agency to integrate outcomes measurements into their daily work. The outcomes training and software are designed to build capacity within the organization, helping them to develop a meaningful measurement system to use universally, not just with CAUW. We encourage them to construct their reports and logic models in such a way that they will be useful as an internal tool for strategic planning, as a way to report to their board of directors and other stakeholders, and as a support in applications for other sources of funding.

A great example of CAUW's data-driven program funding is McMains Children's Developmental Center's therapy program. After seeing the outcomes of a national pilot, McMains obtained a grant to replicate the program in Baton Rouge. They then approached CAUW to help build the program. Since then, CAUW has invested over \$300-400,000 per year in building the capacity of this program: therapists, their training, maintenance on the Therasuit, and so on. CAUW funds allow McMains to provide a sliding payment scale for low income clients, since the majority of those they serve are on Medicaid. In the latest outcomes report to CAUW, 95% of the children at McMains were meeting significant indicators towards their therapeutic goals.

The second part of CAUW's approach to impact funding is the identification and replication of quality community initiatives, especially as they fit within our Education Impact Agenda. A recent example of this is LaPointe. In the spring of 2010, CCDBR and Pointe Coupee Better Access Community Health (BACH), as well as the Wurtele Foundation approached us for funding. CCDBR has been a proven partner with CAUW for many years. Using the principles that CAUW had already developed for evaluating program requests for funding, we convened a detailed study into the

Narratives

feasibility and scalability of the LaPointe proposal. We found that it was an innovative way to address multiple community challenges using a community-based approach to problem solving. This public/private collaborative looked at all of the issues affecting the children in their parish: education, mental health, physical health, crime and family history. This is not the first time that BACH has led a group like this in Pointe Coupee. From 2007-2009 they were the recipient of a Johnson & Johnson grant "Building In-House Capacity in Evaluation: Increasing Sustainability. " The "Conceptual Framework for Program Monitoring and Evaluation of Case Study" that they developed brought them national attention for their ability to leverage a proven record of collaboration (Cooperative Extension Service, two FQHC's, the school board and local physicians) and overcome documented challenges with a low income population. Based on this review, CAUW funds were directed to develop this innovative model and approach to a complex set of problems in a community with low income and low population density.

Over the past 35 years The Arc Baton Rouge has provided a variety of services for children with disabilities and their families. In 2006, The Arc Children's Services was established to encompass all programs related to serving children with disabilities. Teaming is crucial to ensuring the quality of Early Intervention services provided for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families. The Arc Children's Services utilizes the Transdisciplinary Teaming model of Early Intervention, which is the recommended model in the field of Early Intervention. The goal has been to implement a local transdisciplinary/primary service provider model where one provider is the primary service provider, taking the lead in working with children and families to provide Early Intervention services. Other providers collaborate in a consultative teaming process to support the primary service provider in working with the child and family. The EarlySteps program, Louisiana's Infant and Toddler Program for children with disabilities, has encouraged local community programs and providers to increase the teaming process within the state's current structure to more effectively serve the children and families

Narratives

they work with in Louisiana. The Arc's Children's Services, partially funded through CAUW investment, is the only program in Louisiana currently using the transdisciplinary/primary service provider model to provide services to young children in EarlySteps. State administrators of the EarlySteps program are currently working with The Arc to explore ways to replicate their successes across the state to facilitate teaming services for infants and toddlers with disabilities.

As mentioned under section 2biii ("Proposal for Growing Subgrantee Impact"), CAUW will facilitate the sharing of best practices through at least semi-annual presentations by subgrantees, on their programs and areas of expertise. Annually CAUW will also host a public presentation day at which non-profit, government, business and other leaders--from both the local area and from around the state--can learn about the subgrantees' evidence-based models and outcomes. This knowledge-sharing may lead to replication of these evidence-based programs in other regions of our state as well. Annually CAUW will also share the outcomes of these best practices through media releases.

3.c: EVALUATION EXPERIENCE

As mentioned in section 3b, "Experience Growing Program Impact," CAUW works intensively with community organizations to help them build programs and achieve measurable, impactful, positive outcomes. Likewise, also as mentioned previously, CAUW has worked carefully and deliberately to develop a stronger program investment evaluation process, that engages a large number of community members, representing a diversity of experience and viewpoint, to help determine the best return on investment with CAUW funding awards. Since 2008, approximately 160 community members have been engaged by CAUW to engage in a multi-step evaluation of agencies and programs applying for funding.

Over the course of the fall, these trained investment volunteers and CAUW staff members visit applicant programs to see them in action and ask pertinent questions. Agencies submit extensive outcomes reports in January, and the reports are then disseminated to the volunteers. In the spring,

Narratives

volunteers and CAUW staff make a second visit to the agency, where applicant agency staff members outline the ROI on their requested funding investment and the impact of their outcome measurements. At these visits the volunteers seek any necessary clarification of information from the outcomes reports, previous program visit, and any other information they have received about the agency. In both the fall and the spring volunteers participate in CAUW-facilitated meetings, without representatives from applicant agencies. These evaluation meetings allow for discussion among the volunteers, which helps to eliminate bias by focusing the volunteers on facts and results rather than just feel-good stories.

In addition, there is a team of primarily financial service industry volunteers that completes an extensive operation and financial review of agencies and their programs. These volunteers ensure that agencies are following the guidelines of accounting principles, including fiscal oversight and internal controls; that applicants have good standing with reporting procedures (including tax filing requirements and annual liability updates); and that agencies have an engaged board (which volunteers determine by attending a board meeting).

In April applicant programs come before the full panel of investment volunteers, along with representative CAUW staff and board members, to present their requests for funding. These requests are structured in the format of a business presentation, where outcomes are strongly tied to ROI. A few weeks later, the volunteers meet to debate funding decisions based on the documented outcomes of the programs.

If applicant programs are not able to demonstrate meaningful, data-driven outcomes, they are no longer considered for funding. Such programs are offered help in constructing a corrective action plan and are invited to attend outcomes training should they desire to be considered for future funding. This process is intended to continue encouraging program improvement while also ensuring that CAUW maintains the integrity of ROI. As CAUW has offered more outcomes training to

Narratives

community agencies and agencies have, as expected, improved at gathering and demonstrating evidence, our investment process has become increasingly competitive, thereby helping to raise the performance of community agencies.

For the past year CAUW has contracted with an early childhood initiatives consultant, Dr. Geoffrey Nagle. Dr. Nagle is the Director of the Tulane University Institute of Infant and Early Childhood Mental Health and an Associate Professor of Psychiatry at the Tulane University School of Medicine. He also is a Policy Fellow at the Reilly Center for Media & Public Affairs at Louisiana State University and co-founded the LSU/Tulane Early Childhood Policy and Data Center. He serves as the state director of BrightStart, which has been designated by Governor Jindal as the State Early Childhood Advisory Council. Dr. Nagle works closely with state government leaders to enhance Louisiana's early childhood system and to increase the opportunities to provide high quality early care and education. This advocacy has resulted in Quality Start, Louisiana's child care quality rating system, and new laws that create an Early Childhood System Integration Budget, the School Readiness Tax Credits, and the future phased-in expansion to universal Pre-K. Dr. Nagle is a graduate of Duke University with a degree in political science. He moved to New Orleans in 1995 to attend graduate school at Tulane University, where he earned a Master's of Social Work degree in 1996 and a Master's of Public Health degree in 1997. In 2002, he completed his doctoral work in Mental Health Policy Research, an interdisciplinary degree that combined social work, biostatistics, and epidemiology. Dr. Nagle will serve as a consultant to the development and implementation of the Social Innovation Fund project and part of the evaluation team at the LSU/Tulane Early Childhood Policy and Data Center.

Dr. Robert "Kirby" Goidel is Director of the Louisiana State University Manship School's Research Facility, which includes the Public Policy Research Lab and the Media Effects Lab. As senior public policy fellow of the Reilly Center for Media & Public Affairs, he directs the annual Louisiana Survey

Narratives

and provides analysis of the findings to government, organizations, and the media. Dr. Goidel works closely with diverse constituencies to develop survey instruments, analyze data, prepare reports, and present research findings. He received his Ph.D. in political science from the University of Kentucky and is the author of two books and numerous journal articles. He is a professor in the Manship School of Mass Communication and the department of political science.

Drs. Nagle and Goidel founded the LSU/Tulane Early Childhood Policy and Data Center in 2009 with the mission to conduct policy-relevant research, collect timely and appropriate data, and provide statistical and economic analysis to inform early childhood policy decisions. The center has produced several reports including Early Childhood Risk in Louisiana and Greater New Orleans Early Childhood Needs Assessment. They are currently completing work on the second edition of the Early Childhood Risk in Louisiana report which will also include information about the reach of state administered early childhood programs.

Drs. Nagle and Goidel and their staff at the LSU/Tulane Early Childhood Policy and Data Center will team with the Center for Healthier Children, Families and Communities at UCLA to implement the EDI and to manage the subgrantee performance measurement process and use these measures to improve subgrantee performance. The lead at UCLA is Dr. Todd Franke, who is Associate Director of the Center for Healthier Children, Families and Communities. Dr. Franke is currently participating in the evaluation of California's First 5 Initiative that is specifically focusing on School Readiness. The goal of this evaluation is to understand and document the implementation and the effects of services and programs on children, families, communities, and systems of care in order to promote the most promising public policies to support children, families, and communities.

3. d: ABILITY TO PROVIDE PROGRAM SUPPORT AND OVERSIGHT

Capital Area United Way (CAUW) has served the Greater Baton Rouge area for more than 85 years. As part of its traditional role in the community, CAUW runs an annual campaign, engaging

Narratives

thousands of individuals, corporations, and foundations in supporting the community. Throughout most of its history, CAUW raised funds to invest in community agencies based on the recipient's sound management and fiscal policies. Experiences in post-disaster funding coupled with the national United Way trend to expect even greater accountability for investments positioned CAUW to shift from a model of allocating funds for general support of agencies to one of investing in results of community programs, beginning in 2008. Currently, CAUW funds and supports 125 programs in 46 agencies throughout the capital region. As mentioned earlier (see 3b, "Experience Growing Program Impact"), CAUW has a solid history of setting and implementing goals, for itself and among our grantees.

As first steps, CAUW narrowed its sights on four areas of focus -- Education, Income, Health, and Basic Needs -- and began to strengthen the program funding model into one that measures and rewards ROI as well as demonstrates outcomes. Another critical step was to implement a plan for building capacity in community non-profits so that funded organizations are better equipped to report their program outputs; to develop, monitor and report outcomes; and to implement course corrective systems. As part of the transition in its investment model, CAUW strengthened its staff and volunteer capacity to measure outcomes of community programs and to identify programs that are having positive impact. New staff members with relevant expertise and experience have been recruited as part of the Community Investment Department. Professional development for staff and training from nationally-recognized experts has ensured that CAUW staff, volunteers, and funded partners are well-equipped. In addition, intense technical support is delivered by CAUW staff, and a web-based software solution has been implemented to increase capacity for both CAUW and each funded partner.

Financially and fiscally, CAUW's primary role is to be a good steward of community and public resources. CAUW's processes include regular collection of agency audits and financial statements,

Narratives

program visits, site visits, budget/investment request presentations, annual reporting of progress on goals, volunteer oversight, training, technical assistance, and review of anti-terrorism documentation. In instances of issues raised through this intensive process, CAUW staff and volunteers engage in direct conversation with agency executives and board members to determine what corrective actions need to be in place. CAUW actively works to improve its policies and practices to better serve its agency partners and be better stewards of community and public dollars through work groups of agencies, volunteers, board members, and staff.

CAUW is well-positioned with its staff, Board of Directors, and volunteers to provide sound organizational structure to implement the Social Innovation Fund project effectively as part of its Education Impact Agenda. The Education Impact Cabinet, including subject matter experts, members of the CAUW Board of Directors, and staff and other community leaders will provide oversight and guidance for the Education Impact Agenda and the Social Innovation Fund Project. This Cabinet will be responsible for recommending final subgrantee decisions to the Board of Directors and will discuss in its monthly meetings training and technical assistance activities as well as progress of subgrantees towards mutually-negotiated project milestones and outcomes. The CAUW President/CEO and Vice President of Resource Development actively seek major donors to support the work of the Education Impact Agenda.

Several key program positions will support the Social Innovation Fund Project as part of the Education Impact Agenda:

* Program Director (PD) -- The PD will have day-to-day responsibility for managing the CAUW Social Innovation Fund Project. The PD will be a full-time employee of CAUW and will work closely with each of the subgrantees and other community partners to provide coordination. The PD will be responsible for coordinating all aspects of the competitive subgrant process, including the announcement of availability of funds, technical assistance for interested applicants, and review of the

Narratives

proposals. The PD will also be responsible for coordinating training and technical assistance for the selected portfolio of subgrantees. The PD will interface with project evaluators to design an evaluation to ensure that the project's funding has an impact on the desired measurable outcomes. The PD will be supervised by the Director of Education Initiatives and will work closely with the Education Impact Cabinet. The PD will prepare monthly reports to the Cabinet as well as all reports required for the Corporation for National and Community Service (CNCS). The PD will participate in Social Innovation Fund learning circles as appropriate. The PD will be hired once notice of funding is received.

* Senior Vice President of Community Investment -- As CAUW's Senior Vice President of Community Investment, Michele Robinson works with volunteers, community partners, government, faith-based organizations, and staff to increase CAUW's intentional role in community-building activities and investments that focus on preventing problems and strengthening assets in order to better achieve the mission of "Helping People -- Improving Communities." Her role includes managing the oversight of CAUW funds to non-profit organizations, working with the resource development and marketing teams to create products to align investments, developing the compelling data required in building effective plans that target community-wide results and measure outcomes, and developing a plan to advocate for change in the public policy arena. Robinson joined CAUW from the United Way of Northeast Louisiana in Monroe, where she served as Vice President of Community Impact and where she took the lead staff role in the Impact Transformation Partnership between United Way of Northeast Louisiana and United Way of America. Robinson holds a Bachelor of Arts degree from Louisiana Tech University, where she majored in English Education and minored in Psychology. She earned a Master of Arts degree in Marriage and Family Therapy from the University of Louisiana -- Monroe. Robinson will provide the senior management oversight of the Social Innovation Fund project.

Narratives

* Director of Education Initiatives -- Karen Powell oversees education initiatives, including the early childhood impact initiative, in the Community Investment department at CAUW. She works closely with the Impact Cabinet members, subject matter experts, funders, and other leaders in the community; manages volunteers to support education-related projects; and manages collaboratives, including multiple Dolly Parton Imagination Library programs and a FINRA Foundation grant project. Powell brings a diverse background and understanding of multiple aspects of partnership- and coalition-building. Powell holds Bachelor of Arts degrees in English and Philosophy and a Master of Arts degree in English. She has lengthy experience in education, developing trainings and new curricula, policy and infrastructure, and assessments and measurements. She also has experience with research into best practices, program and grant implementation and administration (including grants through 3 CNCS programs--Learn & Serve, AmeriCorps*VISTA, and Senior Corps), staff supervision, electronic database management, and event management. Powell has also served as a CASA (Court Appointed Special Advocate) volunteer for children in the foster care system. Powell will ensure the Social Innovation Fund project aligns with our Education Impact Agenda and will be the direct supervisor of the SIF Program Director.

* Vice President of Finance -- Sandra O'Brien is a graduate of Louisiana State University, with a Bachelor of Science in Accounting, and a licensed CPA. Starting her career in public accounting, O'Brien worked for a large national CPA firm and then moved to regional and local firms, ending in a partnership/owner with a local firm in 1987. She has extensive experience in accounting and auditing matters as well as providing an array of business consulting services in her firms, prior to accepting a position with CAUW. She is also a member of various professional and community organizations. O'Brien's organizational, business, and auditing skills will provide a sound foundation for the skills needed to track, oversee, and monitor the financial activities of the Social Innovation Fund requirements.

Narratives

* Director of Advocacy and Income Initiatives-- After joining CAUW in November 2009, Brad Madden led CAUW into new pursuits of grant funding from foundations and the public sector. Since joining CAUW, Madden has written multiple proposals, developed grants management processes, and provided grant reporting. Prior to joining CAUW, Madden spent five years as a consultant for Accenture. Working primarily in the government practice, Madden developed proposals for projects ranging from a few hundred thousand to over one-hundred million dollars. Among his many consulting projects, Madden served as a reporting and program evaluation expert for both the proposal and initial implementation of a \$200 million federal project for the Department of Defense. Madden also has prior non-profit industry experience in Baton Rouge and Chicago, serving as both a research analyst and program evaluation manager. Madden has a Bachelor of Business Administration degree in Finance from the University of Texas at Austin and Master's degrees--a Master of Business Administration degree in strategic management and economics and a Master of Public Policy degree focused on political institution theory and public sector fiscal management--from the University of Chicago.

* Program Associate -- A Program Associate will be recruited upon notification of funding and will be a part-time employee of CAUW, supervised by the Program Director for the Social Innovation Fund project. The Program Associate will serve as liaison with the CAUW Finance Department and will focus efforts on tracking and reporting.

* Program Coordinator -- Ann Ourso has been a part of the CAUW team since 2007. Her tenure began in the Resource Development Department, where she was involved in raising millions of workplace campaign dollars to reinvest in the community. As the Internal Education Coordinator she manages processes for ensuring staff liaisons' involvement with member agencies and key community partners. Her latest role in providing logistics for the Community Investment Department has allowed her to become increasingly involved in building and sustaining key community relationships with

Narratives

agency directors and community investment volunteers. Her involvement in making sure the program funding process is functioning systematically is critical to the overall process of investing millions of donor dollars into the local community. As a former educator and ongoing community volunteer, Ourso brings a wealth of experience in understanding the complexity of social issues and is a firm advocate for meeting the community's most crucial needs. Ourso will support communications with and training of subgrantees.

* The CAUW Impact Cabinet --the Impact Cabinet is a group of community leaders and subject matter experts who work continuously to develop and advance a plan to achieve CAUW's goal that "children will enter school ready to learn." This group advises CAUW on its 10-year commitment to early childhood development. The Impact Cabinet is comprised of 11 community-based members from diverse business backgrounds including health care, education, law, gas and oil, banking, and real estate.

* CAUW Board of Directors -- the Board of Directors is comprised of community leaders from a wide range of community sectors: industries such as chemical and energy; higher education; law; advertising; hospitals; insurance; commerce; media; city government; communication; engineering; non-profits; retail; banking; and realty.

The Program Director (PD) for the Social Innovation Fund project will work closely with and monitor all subgrantees. The PD will not only be available to answer questions from subgrantees but will also initiate regular, at least monthly, contact with each subgrantee. The PD will report at least monthly to the Director of Education Initiatives and Senior Vice President (SVP) of Community Investment on subgrantees' progress in adhering to data collection and in meeting outcome benchmarks. CAUW will intervene as necessary to provide technical assistance to subgrantees who have questions or are having difficulty meeting expected outcome progression each month. CAUW's SVP of Community Investment, Director of Education Initiatives, and Director of Advocacy and

Narratives

Income Initiatives each have many years of experience monitoring for compliance with programmatic requirements.

Please see section 2biii ("Proposal for Growing Subgrantee Impact") for explanation of our plan for developing subgrantee performance measurement systems, monitoring subgrantees, and using those measurement systems to improve subgrantee performance. To ensure that CAUW is also meeting its program goals for the Social Innovation Fund, the Director of Education Initiatives, LSU/Tulane Early Childhood Policy and Data Center evaluators, and SIF Program Director will prepare monthly reports for the Education Impact Cabinet and the CAUW Board of Directors. CAUW will present at least yearly public updates on the SIF project to the community, through presentations to a cross sector of community members and through media releases and promotional materials. CAUW will also, of course, be held accountable through submission of all required progress reports to CNCS.

3. e: ABILITY TO PROVIDE FINANCIAL SUPPORT AND OVERSIGHT

CAUW has been the recipient of federal funding in the recent past. CAUW has successfully administered two years of a CNCS RSVP grant. Volunteer! United, a wholly-owned subsidiary of CAUW, has obtained and successfully administered CDBG funding for several years and several CNCS Volunteer Generation Fund grants administered through the Louisiana Serve Commission. CAUW acted as the fiscal agent for Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) funds in the aftermath of Hurricanes Katrina, Rita, and Gustav, occurring in August 2005, September 2005, and September 2008, respectively, in areas near or in our ten-parish service area. CAUW has also been the recipient of a FINRA Foundation grant and sponsored dollars for several Dolly Parton Imagination Library (DPIL) programs and other special programs like VITA and EITC tax preparation.

CAUW's Finance, Operations, and Data Management departments are comprised of six people with varying degrees of experience, training, and expertise. The Vice President of Finance (VPF), a

Narratives

Certified Public Accountant with 28 years of public accounting and consulting experience, oversees all financial activities of the organization. Within these departments, there is a strong focus on systems and processes to ensure consistent, timely, and accurate recording of all financial transactions of the organization. The VPF works in tandem with the Director of Operations and Data Management, who has been with CAUW for twelve years. Together, they oversee and manage a support team of three full-time employees and one part time employee, who have been with CAUW for a collective total of almost twenty-eight years. Other staff members, too--the Director of Advocacy and Income Initiatives and the Director of Education Initiatives--also both have extensive experience with grant financial management; the Director of Education Initiatives also has experience specifically with other CNCS programs' financial oversight (Learn & Serve, AmeriCorps*VISTA, and Senior Corps).

CAUW utilizes a sophisticated financial information software program that provides separate tracking of the financial activities of various grants, programs, events, or initiatives, under the umbrella of the single financial information system. The reporting module of the software is customizable for the purpose of any grant and program reporting requirements on multiple levels of details. Additionally, what cannot be tracked within the software can be exported to spreadsheet software and then sorted and reformatted to conform with any unique reporting requirements. This latter approach is currently the procedure for any existing grant or program unique reporting requirements not met automatically by the financial information software. This software has been in use since 2008, and all finance, operations and data management department team members are familiar with its applications and features.

CAUW's operating budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2012 is approximately \$9,900,000. A \$1,000,000 SIF grant would comprise 9% (or, when full match funding is secured, 16.8%). Consequently, the grant's administration would require only modest additional support, administrative man-power, or third-party resources to administer, track, account, and report on the

Narratives

grant proceeds and disbursements.

CAUW currently uses a time-tested and proven approach to screening and selecting its existing funding recipients, and correspondingly, overseeing their compliance with CAUW's recipient award requirements. All such awards are disbursed on a recurring monthly cycle, separate from CAUW's other disbursement cycles, in an economical and timely fashion. Special requests are received and considered carefully as the need arises to assist with sub-recipients cash flow emergency needs. Thus, the specific requirements of becoming the fiscal agent for the grant will be easily integrated into the normal daily operations of the finance, operations, and data management departments as similar functionalities are already in place. The effect of the grant on the support activities of CAUW would not be overwhelming or disruptive, but rather another stream of public support to provide direct community impact dollars. CAUW is in an optimal position to administer the grant in a very cost-effective manner with respect to utilizing existing overhead and administrative resources.

Within the Finance, Operations, and Data Management departments there is a strong emphasis on developing and maintaining a strong internal control system. CAUW uses a formal policy of approval for all expenditures at various levels depending on the amount and authority levels involved. All team members are asked to adhere to a high level of integrity and ethical behavior both in and out of the office to provide the utmost confidence to donors, board members, and other employees, for the highest degree of fiduciary responsibility. CAUW's Finance, Operations, and Data Management departments also utilize detailed job descriptions and areas of responsibility and appropriate authority to provide efficiency but not sacrifice necessary levels of review and approval over the financial activities of the organization. There is an effective segregation of incompatible accounting duties for the recording and reviewing functions over all financial activities. Having such controls protects the organization and its donors, grantors, employees, and Board of Directors from theft, fraud, or abuse.

The grant will be assigned its own unique internal project code, budget, and reporting format for

Narratives

complying with regulatory and internal supervisory requirements. All grant expenditures would be tracked under this unique code and compared to the initially established budget based on the final grant award amounts. Differences in actual expenditure amounts versus the budgeted amounts will be reviewed on a monthly basis as part of the recurring budget variance review process. The Program Director will be responsible for any changes to the budget and related expenditures as the program moves forward, or other changes are necessary.

CAUW has successfully completed annual financial statement audits, in accordance with its Bylaws, with the same independent accounting firm for the last eleven years. There have been no significant management comments or significant weaknesses noted. Plans and preparations have already been undertaken with the external auditors to incorporate the requirements of a Single Audit - OMB Circular 133 should the award of the grant require this additional work be performed. In preliminary discussions with the external auditors, they foresaw no issues or concerns that would lead them to believe CAUW would be unable to comply with the grant requirements based on the long-term relationship and their existing knowledge of the organization.

3.f: STRATEGY FOR SUSTAINABILITY

Community-wide, the Greater Baton Rouge area is entering a period of engagement for change, addressing the foundation of economic prosperity by targeting significant improvement in the development of our young children, and is well-positioned to maximize the impact of these SIF funds. While this grant is for 5 years, CAUW is undertaking a widely-announced 10-year plan to make major impacts in early childhood development outcomes in our 10-parish catchment area. As we have begun to establish the foundation of this commitment, we are primed to collaborate with partners where strategic, data-driven investments will yield the maximum return this decade and begin to re-direct the course of our community's future. Our mission is "Helping People -- Improving Communities," and our goal is to create long-lasting changes by addressing the underlying causes of

Narratives

problems in education, income, and health--the building blocks for a better life and the short- and long-term economic health of the children and their families as well as the community as a whole.

We foresee both private and public scenarios long-term for sustaining Social Innovation Fund investment priorities through continued program growth Key segments of our community -- corporations, government, and other foundations -- are heavily involved in this work on early childhood, which will multiply the effectiveness of the growth of our non-profit subgrantees.

Last year we interviewed over 100 CEOs of public and private sector organizations with headquarters or a strong corporate presence in Louisiana--including Shaw, Albemarle, ExxonMobil, Turner Industries, Dow Chemical, Shell, Entergy, Capital One Bank, and Hancock Bank-- to determine their view of the most systemic issues affecting our communities. The development of youth/education and health were always at the top of their lists as the necessary foundation for stronger economic well-being in our community.

CAUW is engaged in direct talks with both foundations and corporations about helping to underwrite and brand these efforts in our community: they know that making a change in early childhood education and development is essential, and they recognize that this level of change takes time. Consequently, they recognize that this must be a long-term commitment by CAUW and that we therefore need their enduring support.

In Louisiana public policy is vigorously focused on reform efforts of early childhood education at the state level. We have already applied for funding from the Louisiana Children's Trust Fund to implement an evidence-based early childhood development model. State Rep. Steve Carter, the chair of the Louisiana House Education Committee, represents a district in the CAUW catchment area and has committed to supporting our 10-year early childhood commitment. He has shown his support most recently in arranging a presentation on the EDI to senior policy advisors to the governor.

In addition, we also foresee that in both the short- and long-term subgrantees' evidence-based

Narratives

programs would be eligible for not only our regular community investment process but also for special, directed campaign and sponsorship dollars that CAUW will continue to work to raise, to advance our impact initiative.

The \$1 million of federal funding will be matched by fundraising of non-federal funds from foundations and corporations, already committed partners to youth development. We have also provided documentation of our ability, and the commitment from our Board of Directors, to meet matching requirements for year 1 out of existing cash reserves, which are in excess of the required amount, if needed. We are confident in our ability to secure outside matching funds. Any shortfalls of our total match requirement of \$1,000,000 in each of years 2-5 would be provided from unrestricted annual campaign funding (currently nearly \$10,000,000 per year).

Budget/Cost Effectiveness

4.a: BUDGET JUSTIFICATION

CAUW is requesting a \$1,000,000 grant for five years, with a dollar match of \$1,000,000 from non-federal resources, for a combined program budget of \$2,000,000. Of this amount, \$1,600,000 will be distributed to subgrantees. The remaining funds will be leveraged to provide the necessary program framework and technical assistance to subgrantees.

In developing our proposed budget, Capital Area United Way (CAUW) focused on three main principles: (1) achieving our outcomes, (2) investing in evidence based and promising programs, (3) investing in measuring outcomes to document success and inform future investments. In addition, our budget design supports strong subgrantee partnerships and development by: providing 80% of both federal and match dollars to subgrantees and including research and evaluation consultant time. Our budget design supports our expectation of outstanding commitment and results from subgrantees by requiring a minimal amount of funds be spent on research and evaluation consultants. Through these methods we believe we can foster innovation and achievement in our subgrantee programs.

Narratives

PROJECT PERSONNEL AND FRINGE BENEFITS COSTS

We are proposing hiring two new staff members to support the Social Innovation Fund, a full-time Program Director and a part-time Program Associate. The Program Director will be the primary person responsible for implementing the Social Innovation Fund subgrantee process at CAUW. The Program Director will be a part of the Community Investment Department and report to the Director of Education Initiatives. The proposed salary of \$57,500 is commensurate with similar positions within CAUW, and is designed to attract a high quality candidate able to independently manage the program while coordinating with the community impact direction of current CAUW initiatives. The benefits for this position are estimated at 25% of salary (\$14,375), which includes the benefits package offered to all full-time personnel.

The Program Associate will assist the Program Director in the implementation, liaison with the Finance Associate in CAUW's finance department, and maintain communications for the program. The Program Associate is expected to be a part-time (20 hours/week) position. The salary of \$18,000 is the part-time (20 hours/week) equivalent to the salary of our current Finance Associate. As this position is part-time, we do not offer a benefits package.

Salaries for the remaining personnel listed on the program budget represent expected salaries of current personnel at the time of program implementation. Our fiscal year begins on July 1st and the budget was developed with expected salary increases, still pending agency approval. At the time of program implementation, these salaries will be adjusted to actual salaries that have been approved for the new fiscal year. The current estimate of these salary allocations is a combined \$20,625.

For the additional personnel included on the program budget, the percentage of time spent on the program was determined as follows. The Director of Education Initiatives is the direct supervisor of the Program Director and thus will be involved in the direction of the program implementation.

Narratives

This position is expected to spend approximately 25% of her time supervising and directing the program. The Senior Vice President of Community Investment will spend a minimal amount of time overseeing the implementation, included in the budget at 5%. Combined project personnel and fringe benefits costs equal \$110,500.

PROJECT STAFF TRAVEL

Program travel costs include mileage for all employees working on the program as well as travel to national meetings. Mileage is estimated at 2,400 miles per year at a cost of \$0.50 per mile for a total of \$1,200. This will allow for travel across the 10-parishes of our proposed region for all relevant staff working on the program and for conducting site visits to agencies during the subgrantee selection process. The remaining travel estimates include the three CNCS convenings, estimated for Washington, DC. Airfare estimates of \$400 are based on a review of internet travel sites, with flights originating from Baton Rouge, and include baggage fees and taxes. Hotel (\$200/night) and per-diem (\$70/day) costs are based on average federal per-diem rates found on the US General Services Administration website. Our estimates are based on a 3 day/2 night trip. We also included parking costs at Baton Rouge airport (\$40 per traveler). We have included 2 personnel in attendance to allow for both the SIF Program Director as well as Director of Education Initiatives to attend. These estimates total an additional \$6,300 in long-distance travel expenses, for a total travel budget of \$7,500.

SUPPLIES

We have included \$2,000 in our program budget to purchase laptops for the use of the Program Director and Program Associate. In addition, we will evaluate, and possibly expand, our software package we currently use for outcomes reporting from agencies. Should we expand, we will hold an

Narratives

open competition to identify a technology add-on to our current software package that will provide greater data collection and analysis capability to our subgrantees. These technology costs are not included in the budget, but would be paid for through indirect cost funds, if required.

CONSULTANT COSTS

We have included costs for research and evaluation consultants. The LSU/Tulane Early Childhood Policy and Data Center will collaborate with the UCLA Center for Healthier Children, Families and Communities to implement all components of the evaluation. This includes implementation of the Early Development Instrument, facilitating the process of identifying core and elective indicators for the subgrantees, participating in subgrantee selection to score evidence basis for proposed programs, conducting audits of subgrantee data collection systems and program analysis model, and the provision of technical assistance to develop subgrantee capacity, which may include training and mentoring depending on the identified needs of subgrantees. The evaluation will be led by Drs. Geoff Nagle and Kirby Goidel in collaboration with Dr. Todd Franke. Evaluation staff will include an early childhood epidemiologist who currently works at the LSU/Tulane Early Childhood Policy and Data Center and an EDI project manager that will be hired.

Research and evaluation consultant fees are estimated at 8% of federal award plus 8% of subgrantee award, totaling \$208,000. The success of the research and evaluation consultants depends, in part, on the active cooperation and participation of the subgrantees. CAUW has found that too often agencies do not take full advantage of these resources when they are viewed as "free." Therefore, we are proposing that all subgrantees spend 8% of their total award on the research and evaluation consultants. By requiring subgrantees to spend a minimal amount on the consultants, each subgrantee will view the time they receive from the consultant as a part of their program expenses and investment, and not just a requirement of the award. Based on subgrants of

Narratives

\$1,600,000, this would represent the subgrantees funding \$128,000 of the total research and evaluation consultant costs. CAUW will pay the remaining \$80,000 of this cost, determined by the same 8% estimation applied to the entire federal award. CAUW will also assume all cost overruns should more hours be required. For a subgrantee receiving the minimum award of \$100,000, this will mean a \$8,000 contribution, sufficient to place a monetary value on the consultant time offered to each subgrantee while not overly-burdening the program budget.

OTHER COSTS

Subgrants will be 80% of both federal and non-federal funding, totaling \$1,600,000. Of this, \$128,000 will be required of the subgrantees to spend on evaluation. To maintain continuity and offer a comprehensive evaluation, all subgrantees will also use the LSU/Tulane Early Childhood Policy and Data Center.

We have also included \$44 per staff member included in the budget for criminal history background checks for a total of \$176. As some staff members have a criminal history background check on record with CNCS, we may not need each staff member to complete this requirement, depending on the grant guidelines. (Note: We reduced our indirect costs by an equivalent \$176. As we are uncertain the exact costs required given the uncertainty in personnel required to complete as well as the variability of the expense depending on the service provider, we would absorb any cost overruns through our indirect costs. We included the line item to comply with the NOFA requirements).

INDIRECT COSTS

CAUW does not currently have a negotiated indirect cost rate agreement with the federal government, though we will pursue one upon grant award. We have incorporated indirect costs into

Narratives

the proposed grant budget based on our own internal analysis. Our internal indirect cost rate is 19.7%.

For the purposes of the Social Innovation Fund grant, we have only incorporated a 10% indirect cost rate into the budget, in order to maximize the sub-grant amount. This 10% was based on a \$2,000,000 total budget (federal and match funding combined), less the \$176 criminal history background check (see previous note), for a total of \$199,824.

In order to determine our internal indirect cost rate, an objective formula in accord with United Way Worldwide (UWW) standards is utilized. Staff member time is recorded and allocated across three major functional areas, as well as multiple departments, projects, and/ or cost centers. In addition, there are types of expenses that are eligible for allocation, such as management and general activities, as well as building, technology and occupancy expenses, that are not identifiable with specific programs, grants, fundraising activities, or membership development. These costs are inherent to the overall organization and allocations are made based on the ratio of the number of staff in the non-allocable departments divided by the total number of staff.

4.b: Description of Match Sources and Capacity

CAUW will actively seek match funding from two primary groups. First, we will leverage our relationships with local foundations, including the Baton Rouge Area Foundation and the Pennington Family Foundation, to solicit match funding support. We have long-term relationships with many foundations as members of the local Funder's Circle, an association of major local supporters of non-profit programs and agencies. Many of these local funders are currently engaged in our annual program funding process to learn about our data-driven approach to investment.

Second, we will seek match funding from industrial corporations with major facilities and operations in our area, including ExxonMobil, Shell, The Dow Chemical Company and The Shaw Group. In meetings with the CEO's of the 100 largest companies in our 10-parish region, we have clearly heard

Narratives

their interest in investing further in the education of our community. Beginning in early 2011 we hosted presentations with industry leaders regarding the link between early childhood education and workforce preparedness, highlighting both the short and long term economic impact of investments. As our campaign continues, we have pursued grant funding to translate this awareness into targeted investments in our early childhood community impact initiatives, and will expand this campaign to include match funding for Social Innovation Fund grant dollars.

While our initial discussions and presentations indicate that sufficient matching funds will be available to meet the grant requirements, our Board of Directors and executive leadership have committed to meeting all match requirements. Our submitted documentation includes two letters. The first is from the board of directors indicating our commitment to meeting any match fundraising shortfalls, up to and including the full \$1,000,000 required. The second is from our executive leadership indicating our unrestricted cash position in excess of the 50% required documentation required at grant submission, as well as in excess of the full \$1,000,000 required upon award. CAUW is committed to early childhood development in the capital area, and will commit the necessary funds to develop innovative programs in our region.

Through these same partnerships, we will support subgrantees in their pursuit of match funds. We will facilitate meetings and presentations of programs to community funders. We will also involve funders early in the process to ensure ample time to review and select programs for funding. Finally, promising programs may be considered for other CAUW annual funding processes, including our program investment and impact investment processes, which utilize other annual funds to invest in our community.

Clarification Summary

The Capital Area United Way (CAUW) decided to pursue a SIF grant because it offers such an exciting opportunity to receive an extraordinary level of financial and technical support that aligns

Narratives

with our impact initiative focus. Indeed, a SIF grant seems like the next natural progression in CAUW's trajectory. In 2004 the CAUW Board of Directors decided to transform the CAUW business model: like other United Ways nationally, the Board saw that while CAUW was raising large amounts of money to try to address community needs, these efforts still were not solving community problems. Consequently, the CAUW Board moved to transition into an impact model of funding, to get to the root of community issues more effectively.

In addition to moving to an impact model of funding, beginning in 2009-10 CAUW began to engage community leaders in a discussion of a core impact strategy to effect even deeper community change. As these discussions and research revealed, the root of many community needs occurs in early childhood. Better supported early childhood development and school readiness efforts lead to the elimination or decrease of many community problems. We have pursued this SIF grant because it is a logical way to begin to resource this strategy, as it would provide an unprecedented opportunity in this community to launch significant change.

It is also a time of great opportunity in this state and region to move the needle on child well-being more substantially, not only because people here are increasingly interested in reform and innovation but also because people--public and private--are focused on the potential of early childhood initiatives to change the community's future health. Moreover, this is a time in which there are many great programs and models present, to learn from and implement. These promising practices need more support to develop, extend their outreach, and demonstrate at a larger scale their results: the federal portion of SIF funding, and the matching local funds that it would leverage, would provide that support. Furthermore, we believe that it will be easier to raise an even higher level of local dollars in response to such a large investment by a funder like CNCS: with such a show of support and validation offered by an outside panel, it makes business sense to leverage dollars being offered to the community, and there is more at stake in procuring support dollars.

Narratives

Despite the fact that this is a transitional time in our organization's leadership, in ongoing conversations with our Board of Directors Chair, our Impact Cabinet, and community leaders, the early childhood initiative remains an important priority. The CAUW Board has been consistent in its votes to approve our initiative's work and progress: joining the portfolio of SIF projects would further align with CAUW's focus.

* Please provide more detail on the required characteristics or profile of applicants you are seeking, especially what qualifies as an "early childhood intervention" and how that will be determined. For example, is it a function of ages served, the nature of the model offered or the types of outcomes irrespective of model design?

We are looking for applicant programs which support any of our 5 early childhood impact goals: improved birth outcomes; parents educated, engaged, and supported to meet their children's needs; access to quality care for children; children's social-emotional needs met; children's physical and safety needs met. The following common interventions, as identified by early childhood experts, qualify as some examples of applicable "early childhood intervention" for our project: assessment of child development; primary and specialty medical care; developmental disability services; mental health services (social, emotional, behavioral); family and social support (basic needs, family functioning, violence, parenting classes); child advocacy; and early education/quality care. Because we are taking a comprehensive, big picture approach, we want to see many efforts supported that help build a range of early childhood strengths and competencies.

What qualifies as an "early childhood intervention" is certainly then in many cases related to "ages served": early childhood work, supporting children age 0-5, should be a focus, feature, and/or specialty of many our applicants. At the same time, though, it is not incumbent upon applicant models, as long as the nature of the model proposed or types of outcomes demonstrated and expected meet in some way one of the 5 early childhood impact goals identified above. "Early childhood

Narratives

intervention" consequently includes services that support the parents of those young children, too, as kids' school readiness is certainly related to parents' ability to provide more stable early childhood home environments for their children.

Within these two approaches to early childhood intervention (through the children or through the parents), obviously we plan to look for applicants, as we already do in our Program Investment process, who meet the following standards: whose programs align with that applicant organization's own mission; experience with the work being proposed; measurable results; beneficial outcomes; the organization's overall community track record of accountability; the level of collaboration of the organization with other community partners; the organization's financial health; and commitment from the organization's Board of Directors to support the SIF initiative if selected as a subgrantee.

*You mention specific models that will be encouraged. Knowing the local market as you do, what is the approximate number of such programs operating in your area? What level of confidence do you have that there are enough programs of these types -- or any other qualified types -- to provide an adequate-sized pool of high-quality, evidence-based applicants?

The Capital Region has numerous non-profit organizations operating strong evidence-based models, including for the types of early childhood interventions defined above. For example, 10 agencies in the Capital Area alone are operating the Triple P model described in our proposal. There are many existing grantees of CAUW (approximately 50 in total) who are potential applicants for Social Innovation Fund subgrantee funds and a much larger potential pool of applicants who are not current partners but would be excellent candidates for SIF applicants (and even more so when including the number of organizations outside of our 10-parish area who may apply to provide services under our SIF project). We are confident that we will have an adequate pool of applicants from which to choose subgrantees to meet our 5 defined outcomes in early childhood development.

*What is the intended geographical scope of your search for subgrantees? Are you only seeking local

Narratives

organizations or are you also receptive to applications from organizations working outside your state/region?

The intended geographical scope of our search will be for subgrantee organizations who will serve community members in our 10-parish region (East Baton Rouge, West Baton Rouge, West Feliciana, East Feliciana, Pointe Coupee, St. Helena, Ascension, Iberville, Livingston, and St. James). We expect that a substantial number of subgrantee applicants would probably already be based in and/or serving in one or more of these parishes. However, subgrantee applicants will not be required to have their offices based in those 10 parishes nor would they have to serve in the area currently. By opening up the subgrantee competition to organizations working outside our coverage area, the possibility that successful models implemented elsewhere can be replicated here is increased.

It will be important to monitor all subgrantees to ensure success, of course, but it will be especially important to monitor subgrantees which do not have an existing presence in our 10-parish area, to ensure that they are successfully integrating into this market. All applicants, regardless of their base, should have a record of success in serving identified needs of community members'. Applicants with experience and success meeting early childhood support needs and with some level of presence in the area (which may make them more likely to be successful) may be weighted higher.

*Please explain in more detail how you will ensure that the subgrantee selection process is free of conflicts of interest and bias, given your existing funding relationships and knowledge base about agencies operating in your area, especially if your search is confined to local organizations.

To ensure, as much as possible, that the subgrantee selection process is free of conflicts of interest and bias as well as to ensure that we select the most effective subgrantees, we will design an RFP that focuses on what model an applicant is proposing to follow and the model's evidence base; the RFP will call for very specific information on the proposed model's effectiveness and outcomes. We will also design an evaluation rubric for all reviewers to use that requires each reviewer to assess every

Narratives

application on the same key factors. As with our existing Program Investment process, the RFP will request that applicants submit a logic model that tells the story of how and why the proposed program operates and outlines its overall goals. Applicants' logic models will be assessed as to whether the outcomes meet the intent of the program, the inputs are an appropriate mix to achieve goals, the activities relate clearly to the outcomes, outputs are clearly distinguished from outcomes, and the program demonstrates changes and improvements if needed based on outcome measurement data. At the end of the review process, we will publish application scores to demonstrate that subgrantees were selected on the basis of how well they met the review criteria.

Our existing Program Investment process also already works hard to ensure a process free of conflicts of interest or bias. Currently CAUW has a zero-based funding process in which no applicant agencies, not even those who have been partners in the past, are guaranteed any level of funding from year to year. Program Investment volunteers weigh the applicant agencies' outcomes against their requests and award them funding based on those outcomes. Over the last few years agencies have received both higher and lower funding than previous years based on the investment volunteers' evaluation of the agencies' outcomes. In feedback volunteers have noted that although they might support the mission of an applicant organization they have to see stronger outcomes to fund it and/or to increase funding for it.

As our proposal explains, we will have multiple external reviewers, of 4 types, review each application, to ensure a diversity of perspective: 1 early childhood expert, 1 evaluator from LSU/Tulane, 1 area foundation representative, and 1 community investment volunteer. Like SIF, CAUW would also review each application for Compliance and Eligibility. We will survey all reviewers as to their community affiliations as well, to ensure that none have received services from or serve on the Board of Directors or in another capacity at an applicant agency whose application they are assigned to review.

Narratives

*Because you are a current CNCS grantee, we are aware that your organization has experienced recent leadership staff turnover and difficulty with recruiting volunteers. We are also aware that you will soon relinquish a RSVP grant. Please explain the status of these situations and your ability to carry out a program with the size, scope, and high demands of the SIF.

CAUW is relinquishing its RSVP grant for two reasons: financial and mission-related. As you know, in the past 2 years RSVP grants received a 20% federal cut. At the time CAUW received the grant, due to statewide budget cuts we also lost all previous state funding for RSVP--which amounted to approximately 1/6 of the grant award. This meant that despite our best efforts financially we could not sustain the grant. Our 20+ year old very successful Volunteer Center also works more to integrate volunteers of all ages together, so the RSVP Project just was not the right fit for our community. We did appreciate the experience of holding the grant for that period and greatly increased CAUW's outreach to senior volunteers during that time. Most of the senior volunteers we found who are not already serving somewhere preferred more episodic volunteering opportunities than the kind of ongoing ones that better fit the CNCS impact objectives for RSVP. We did, however, recruit and match many new volunteers to service, and we will continue to do this senior outreach. Some of the volunteers recruited are beginning to support our early reading initiatives, too. Our RSVP grant ended 6/30, and we will submit all final reports by deadline.

Although we certainly do not underestimate how considerably larger a SIF project is than the other CNCS projects (Learn & Serve and AmeriCorps*VISTA) our staff has had experience managing, we do believe that those previous experiences with CNCS have been valuable ones that would support our SIF reporting and monitoring of subgrantees. Moreover, in addition to existing staff members' commitment to the SIF project, we would be hiring a full-time SIF Project Director as well as a SIF financial assistant for the project and continuing to work with a highly-skilled team of program evaluators, with whom we already work effectively. Consequently, CAUW is confident about our

Narratives

capacity to carry out our proposed SIF project successfully.

As you will find reiterated in a letter from the CAUW Board of Directors Chair which we are e-mailing to you, despite our recent leadership staff turnover we are confident that we are still in a strong position to deliver a successful SIF project. The primary leadership driving the early childhood development initiative forward--the Director of Education Initiatives, the Impact Cabinet, and the Board of Directors--remains the same and remains committed to this work. As mentioned earlier, in 2004 the Board of Directors made a monumental change in CAUW's business model. With that comes natural and expected "bumps" and adjustments; throughout these recent adjustments, however, which have been made to ensure that CAUW programs receive proper support, the CAUW Board of Directors has been consistent in its support for the impact model of funding and programming. Indeed, the incoming Board of Directors Chair serves as the Executive Director of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Foundation, which manages a multi-million dollar Challenge grant portfolio; she not only has experience with such size programs, she is also a huge supporter of early childhood initiatives in our community.

Further, the Board is extremely confident in their decision to bring in Richard Williams as an interim CEO of CAUW. His experience both in business and in a non-profit made him ready to immediately take control of and run CAUW on a daily basis and suggest improvements to the Board with the future in mind. Consequently, when CAUW selects a new CEO the Board can be assured that the new leader will step into a stable situation continuing to move in the right direction. Mr. Williams' tenure gives the Board the opportunity to search for the right CEO for the community and the organization, who understands and is likewise committed to this business model and impact initiative.

*Per your application, you propose to give preference to organizations that are using models that have proven evidence. Should they be selected, please explain how you plan to add to/improve the evidence

Narratives

base of organizations using models that already have strong or proven evidence. Also, how do you expect to factor evidence levels into your decisions regarding the amount of the award?

As we say in our proposal, we anticipate that some subgrantee applicants may demonstrate preliminary or moderate levels of evidence, if they have not had the resources or support to improve upon that previously. If they are selected as subgrantees, we aim to support them to add to their own existing evidence base by encouraging them to follow nationally-proven models, so they attain strong levels of evidence and success. In the case of subgrantees using newer, less tested models, or even of subgrantees using proven models that are new to them, we will help these organizations add to / improve their evidence base through the ongoing technical assistance we will be offering on data collection and evaluation.

In regard to organizations already using models that have proven evidence, we actually do not expect to add to those models' evidence bases, because the models we specifically mentioned and selected are already tested and validated ones nationally. Rather, when applicants propose to use one of those models, we want to be sure those proven models are being adhered to properly. By giving those organizations funding for those models, they should be able to mirror the existing evidence base of that model, which already shows that the model works.

We will factor evidence levels into the review process by adding points into the review criteria for an applicant's use of an evidence-based model. This will make such an applicant more likely to be funded, as our intention is not just to add to the evidence base of models with preliminary and moderate evidence but to capitalize on the evidence base of proven programs by investing in them.

The LSU/Tulane Early Childhood Policy and Data Center will provide to all subgrantees initial training on effective data collection and assessment practices, as that team works with the organizations to develop both the overall and their individual evaluation plans. CAUW and LSU/Tulane will also offer ongoing technical assistance to subgrantees, to ensure that they are

Narratives

building strong evidence to support their programs. In addition, we will partner with other agencies, including government agencies or any other organizations in the region successfully executing proven models, to provide support to help subgrantees build their evidence base.

To factor evidence levels into our award process, again, we would include in our review rubric questions that would demonstrate whether an applicant is using and/or will implement an evidence-based model (referring, for example, to SIF's definitions of evidence and perhaps using examples from something like the "Evidence-Based and Evidence-Informed Programs and Practices Checklist" used by the Community-Based Child Abuse Prevention network, which has questions about the programmatic and research & evaluation characteristics of the models applicants are using or wish to implement). Meeting a higher number of those standards could result in a higher level of funding for those applications

* Please explain the process of the quality rating accreditation services as it relates to the subgrantees that you will select. Will subgrantees pay for these services themselves or will it be done through the grant? Will any of these child care centers be for-profit entities?

The quality rating mentioned in our proposal is not an accreditation. Rather it is a process administered by the state that provides the community an unbiased measure of a childcare center's success.

The Quality Start rating would not apply to any of our subgrantee agencies because the rating system applies solely to individual child care centers. While we will potentially be funding agencies which provide support (such as mental health consultation) to childcare centers to help the centers to improve their Quality Start ratings, we will not be funding any child care centers directly.

Assistance in improving ratings comes either from state representatives or state-contracted agencies, such as those who might apply to be SIF subgrantees. Because the state wants to ensure the improvement of all early child learning, the assistance is not something for which the childcare

Narratives

centers pay and is made available to them as long as they are participating in the rating system; assistance is offered to any childcare center, whether a non-profit Early Head Start or Head Start Center or a private center like a family home provider.

*Please explain in more detail how you will oversee the monitoring that will be provided by volunteers. How will you recruit, vet, and train these volunteers? How will you ensure that a consistent and sufficient assessment of the subgrantee's performance and compliance takes place?

The only certain involvement volunteers will have in the SIF project is in the subgrantee application review process. We expect that the early childhood education experts will come primarily from government and higher education: they will be reviewing the applications for applicants' demonstrated understanding of early childhood interventions (as defined earlier). Our contracted evaluators will be reviewing the applications for the strength of the models proposed. Our foundation representatives are already experienced in reviewing funding applications. So are our program investment volunteers. All 4 types of reviewers will be invited by written communication to serve as reviewers, with explanation of the expectations required of reviewers. We will compose a list of early childhood experts active in the region and state (at LSU, Tulane, DCFS, and DOE), representatives of the four major local foundations, and our most experienced investment volunteers and extend this invitation to them. As mentioned earlier, all volunteers will be vetted to ensure that they do not have conflicts of interest or bias. All the volunteers will also attend a session that provides a review of our project's goals, our RFP, what qualifies as effective outcomes, the criteria on the evaluation rubric, and their role as reviewers.

Volunteers are not expected to be used to monitor selected subgrantees. Rather, subgrantees will be monitored for compliance and performance by the CAUW staff members overseeing this project and our contracted professional evaluators from LSU/Tulane. If during the course of the subgrantee performance year subgrantees identify a need for training that can be effectively provided by an

Narratives

external consultant from any of our reviewer pools, based on that individual's expertise and qualifications, then that volunteer would be asked to provide training. Volunteer reviewers will also be invited to the proposed annual presentations by the subgrantees and may offer additional feedback at that time as to how effectively subgrantees seem to have met proposed outcomes.

*Please describe your plan for staffing the SIF program. What is the timeline for hiring the SIF Program Director?

If accepted into the SIF portfolio of projects, we would want to begin the process of hiring the SIF Program Director as soon as possible. In August we would ask previous year SIF grant recipients to share their SIF PD job descriptions with us, as a model and base for our own description. We would then begin the search in September, advertising the position and collecting applications. We would hope to hire the SIF PD by mid- to late-October, in order to provide training to him or her while the project awaits the submission of subgrantee proposals and so that the PD may offer assistance in RFP outreach, proposal collection, and reviewer assignment.

While we want to hire the Program Director as soon as possible, we do feel it is crucial to hire the right person to direct the day-to-day operations of the project, so we will extend our search if necessary, depending upon the skills of the position applicants. The entire hiring process for the PD will occur alongside the development of the subgrant plan document, the RFP development, and possibly even the start of the RFP distribution.

*Your application describes providing technical assistance for subgrantees on conducting program evaluations and making data-driven program decisions. Please explain in more detail the training and technical assistance you will provide to build the capacity of subgrantee organizations in terms of scaling. What are the roles of Dr. Nagle and Dr. Goidel in this area?

For those subgrantees with only preliminary or moderate levels of evidence, focused attention on program evaluation and data-driven program decisions will be provided both upfront and throughout.

Narratives

This work, to be led by the LSU/Tulane/UCLA partnership, under the direction of Drs. Goidel and Nagle, will be designed to improve the evidence base of these programs. The objective here will be to implement a rigorous evaluation of these programs with the intent to move these subgrantees to a higher level of evidence.

Types of support to be provided will include strategies on data collection, use of technology, using data for decision-making, implementing best practices, and directly supporting the evaluation by providing supervision. More specific supports will be determined based on monthly monitoring of the data collection and semi-annual site visits. Additional site visits or meetings will be conducted on an as-needed basis. We think it is crucial to meet subgrantees where they are, and we will not fully know that until they are selected. The purpose is to determine where individual subgrantee technical assistance is needed in the area of evaluation planning, implementation, and performance improvement and provide the needed support. This close working relationship is intended to lead to a greater commitment to using data for performance and program improvement by the subgrantees and ultimately to replication and expansion of the program if justified by the data.

Besides the technical assistance that will be offered under the direction of Drs. Goidel and Nagle, CAUW is fortunate to have, through the leaders in our organization, on our Impact Cabinet, on our Board, and in our partner agencies, connections with other non-profit agency, foundation, government, and higher education experts. We will ask them to offer additional trainings and guidance we determine our subgrantees need, as we work closely with the subgrantees, if the connections have relevant expertise to share. This collective technical assistance will help the subgrantees document their importance to the community so they can raise other funds to sustain the program.

*EDI seems to be the focus of all evaluation plans but it is not clear that this will meet the requirement of a moderate level evaluation for the programs or portfolio approach you propose to

Narratives

fund. Please clarify how you intend to use the EDI and supporting evaluation efforts to measure the impact of your individual subgrant programs in effecting the outcomes you have identified. In other words, how will the EDI help you assess whether the improvements you may see can be attributed to the programs you invest in? If this will not be achieved through the EDI, how do you propose to achieve this as it seems all listed evaluation investment is supporting the Tulane/LSU EDI initiative?

Our project proposes to integrate both immediate (of the subgrantees) and broader, longer-term (of the CAUW project) evaluations:

The EDI is a long-term evaluation tool and is critical as it will show community-wide impacts and ensure a process to document the success of this large-scale grant initiative across all of the subgrantees. Our goal is to "shift the curve" for our entire community as shown by school readiness.

It is also critically important to demonstrate throughout each year of the grant that specific programmatic investments in the subgrantees are producing the desired outcomes, by documenting whether the investments are successful and warrant ongoing, and/or expanded, support. Therefore, as described earlier, we will also work with all of the subgrantees to increase their ability to document measurable outcomes by providing technical assistance around the following as needed: performance measurement, data collection, use of technology, using data for decision-making, implementing best practices, and directly supporting the evaluation of a subgrantee by providing supervision of their evaluation work.

As described in the proposal (as the "First 5 California initiative"), a very participatory approach to the ongoing, subgrantee evaluation will culminate in defining core or common indicators that would be used by all subgrantees (e.g., school readiness, economic well-being) and elective indicators that would be used by specific subgrantees only focusing on outcomes relevant to their program or intervention. The exact approach used for the different evaluations will be determined once subgrantees are selected and will take into consideration program size, phase of development, current

Narratives

level of evidence supporting the program, and logistics for selecting comparison groups. For example, depending on the program that the subgrantee will implement, the evaluation technical assistance could directly help achieve a higher level of evidence through appropriate data sharing. Specifically, by facilitating data sharing agreements within and between school districts and/or with the Louisiana Department of Education, data shared between subgrantees and school districts can be used in quasi-experimental studies working to correlate gains with standardized testing scores or the forthcoming kindergarten entry assessments that will be implemented in Louisiana by the 2013-14 school year. This may not be feasible or practical for all subgrantees, but is an example of the type of evaluation that may evolve once the subgrantees are identified.

Ultimately, the work of the SIF Program Director, in conjunction with Drs. Goidel, Nagle and Franke, will be to ensure that data is collected and analyzed using a valid methodology to determine whether program replication and/or expansion of the program is warranted and to indicate the appropriate steps for this growth.

*You propose a total evaluation budget of \$208,000 for the independent contractor to participate in subgrantee selection, collect EDI data, identify core and elective indicators for subgrants, and provide technical assistance. It is not clear whether this is sufficient to carry out individualized, rigorous evaluations with individualized program measures. Please provide additional clarity regarding the appropriateness of this number.

We applied a benchmark percentage of 8% to both CAUW's federal funds received (\$1,000,000) as well as the amount of subgrant funds received by subgrantees (\$1,600,000). As with all budgets, the \$208,000 is an estimate. CAUW recognizes that this estimate, while based on previous experience of the prevailing costs of technical assistance and evaluation in our area, may prove insufficient over time. CAUW's 10 year commitment to early childhood development includes a strong emphasis on outcomes and data-driven measures of success. CAUW is committed to ensuring that our evaluation

Narratives

is high quality and receives the time and resources needed for it to be successful. As such, CAUW is prepared to meet additional costs as necessary to meet this objective, including decreasing our recapture of indirect costs. While we do not anticipate that this will be necessary, it is a possibility that we have discussed as a contingency.

Continuation Changes

(N/A)

Required Documents

Document Name

Status

Match Verification

Sent