

Grant writing for HEP and CAMP

THE UNIVERSITY
OF TEXAS
RIO GRANDE
VALLEY

UTRGV.EDU

Noel Rodriguez

Program Director

CAMP • Brownsville

*BMSLC 1.106A, One West University Dr, Brownsville, TX
78520*

P: 956-882-7872 • F: 956-882-7876

noel.rodriguez@utrgv.edu

Andres Muro, PhD

Director, Community Education Program

El Paso Community College

(915) 831-4161

andresmuro@aol.com



Priorities CAMP

- ▶ *Competitive Preference Priority 1—Promoting Science, Technology, Engineering, or Math (STEM) Education, With a Particular Focus on Computer Science. (Up to 5 points)*
- ▶ *Competitive Preference Priority 2—Consideration of Prior Experience. (Up to 15 points)*
- ▶ *Invitational Priority 1—New Potential Grantees.*
- ▶ *Invitational Priority 2—Support for Remote Learning.*

Priorities HEP

- ▶ *Competitive Preference Priority 1—Fostering Flexible and Affordable Paths to Obtaining Knowledge and Skills. (Up to 5 points)*
- ▶ *Competitive Preference Priority 2—Consideration of Prior Experience. (Up to 15 points)*
- ▶ *Invitational Priority 1—New Potential Grantees*
- ▶ *Invitational Priority 2—Support for Remote Learning*

Need for project (up to 10 points)

- ▶ (1) The Secretary considers the need for the proposed project.
- ▶ (2) In determining the need for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the magnitude of the need for the services to be provided or the activities to be carried out by the proposed project. (Up to 10 points)

Quality of the project design (up to 24 points)

- ▶ (1) The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project.
- ▶ (2) In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:
 - ▶ (i) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable. (Up to 7 points)
 - ▶ (ii) The extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs. (Up to 5 points)
 - ▶ (iii) The extent to which the proposed project will establish linkages with other appropriate agencies and organizations providing services to the target population. (Up to 5 points)
 - ▶ (iv) The extent to which the proposed project demonstrates a rationale (as defined in this notice). (Up to 7 points)

Rational

- ▶ *Demonstrates a rationale* means a key project component included in the project's logic model is informed by research or evaluation findings that suggest the project component is likely to improve relevant outcomes.

Logic Model/Management Plan HEP

Logic Model HEP				
Inputs	Outputs			
<p>EPCC Expertise with HEP for 15 Years.</p> <p>Theoretical Foundation, Dewey, Freire, Greene, Five Step Model, STEP Model.</p> <p>Funding from US Department of Education</p> <p>In-kind Contribution from EPCC</p>	Objectives	Persons responsible	Milestones	Timetable
	Conduct recruitment	Principal Investigator(PI), Partners, Recruiters, Educational Promotoras,	No less than 100 qualifying participants are identified	Ongoing
	Provide instruction	PI, Instructional Manager, Educators, EPCC Testing Center	No less than 100 participants receive 150 hours of instruction and 80% earn a GED certificate	Instruction ongoing June 2017, 80% earn GED
	Transition to college or employment	Educators, EPCC, Career Center, Workforce Board	No less than 80% of GED recipients transition to college or upgrade employment	June 2017
	Provide support services	Recruiters, Educational Promotoras, EPCC Counselors, Partners, Health Educator	Student barriers are identified and students receive assistance with counseling, transportation, health care, day care, housing, legal, domestic trauma as needed	Ongoing
	Offer science based health education	Health Educator	10 hours of health education w/ an emphasis in science and math are offered to 100 participants	Ongoing
	Offer academic enrichment	Creative writing Instructor	10 hours of creative writing instruction are offered and students published a creative writing journal	Ongoing June 2017, journal is published

Logic Model/Management Plan CAMP

Logic Model CAMP				
Inputs	Outputs			
EPCC Expertise with HEP for 15 Years. Theoretical Foundation, Dewey, Freire, Greene, Five Step Model, STEP Model. Funding from US Department of Education In-kind Contribution from EPCC	Objectives	Persons responsible	Milestones	Timetable
	Conduct recruitment	Principal Investigator(PI), Partners, Project Director Educational Promotoras,	No less than 40 qualifying participants are identified	June-August 2016
	Provide orientation and transition	Director, Counselor, Transitional specialist, Instructional manager	No less than 40 participants complete a 40 hour orientation and transition course and enroll in college	June-August 2016
	Provide computer training	Computer instructor	No less than 40 participants receive 55 hours of computer instruction	Ongoing
	Provide tutoring	Director, Instructional manager, Tutors	Participants receive, at least 4 hours of tutoring weekly	Ongoing
	Provide support services	EPCC counseling, CAMP staff, partners	Student barriers are identified and students receive assistance with counseling, transportation, health care, day care, housing, legal, domestic trauma as needed	Ongoing
	Provide financial support	EPCC financial aid office, CAMP staff	No less than 40 students receive financial aid	June-August 2016
	Offer academic and cultural enrichment	Creative writing Instructor, tutors	10 hours of creative writing instruction are offered and students publish a creative writing journal	Ongoing, journal published by May 2017
	Offer career counseling	EPCC Career Center, Workforce Development Board	40 students complete a career assessment and identify a potential career	Aug-Dec 2016

Quality of project services (up to 24 points)

- ▶ (1) The Secretary considers the quality of the services to be provided by the proposed project.
- ▶ (2) In determining the quality of the services to be provided by the proposed project, the Secretary considers the quality and sufficiency of strategies for ensuring equal access and treatment for eligible project participants who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability. (Up to 3 points)
- ▶ (3) In addition, the Secretary considers the following factors:
 - ▶ (i) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project are appropriate to the needs of the intended recipients or beneficiaries of those services. (Up to 7 points)
 - ▶ (ii) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project involve the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project services. (Up to 7 points)
 - ▶ (iii) The likely impact of the services to be provided by the proposed project on the intended recipients of those services. (Up to 7 points)

Quality of project personnel (Up to 10 points).

- ▶ (1) The Secretary considers the quality of the personnel who will carry out the proposed project.
- ▶ (2) In determining the quality of project personnel, the Secretary considers the extent to which the applicant encourages applications for employment from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability. (Up to 3 points)
- ▶ (3) In addition, the Secretary considers the qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel. (Up to 7 points)

Adequacy of resources (up to 12 points)

- ▶ (1) The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources for the proposed project.
- ▶ (2) In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:
 - ▶ (i) The adequacy of support, including facilities, equipment, supplies, and other resources, from the applicant organization or the lead applicant organization. (Up to 4 points)
 - ▶ (ii) The relevance and demonstrated commitment of each partner in the proposed project to the implementation and success of the project. (Up to 4 points)
 - ▶ (iii) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project. (Up to 4 points)

Quality of the project evaluation (up to 20 points)

- ▶ (1) The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project.
- ▶ (2) In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors:
 - ▶ (i) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project. (Up to 10 points)
 - ▶ (ii) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes. (Up to 5 points)
 - ▶ (iii) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce promising evidence (as defined in this notice) about the project's effectiveness. (Up to 5 points)

Promising evidence

- ▶ As defined in 34 CFR 77.1, promising evidence means that there is evidence of a key project component's effectiveness as stipulated by the What Works Clearinghouse.