

**Consideration of Appeal****Tab 4****Background:**

At the November 2, 2011 meeting, the Executive Committee reviewed recommendations from the review panel for the Inclusive Faith-Based Symposium projects. The Committee authorized funding for four proposals recommended as fundable by the independent review panel. The Texas Impact Education Fund submitted two proposals for projects, one to initiate activities in the Dallas-Ft. Worth and Houston areas of the state, the second to initiate activities in Austin and South Texas. Neither of the proposals submitted by the Texas Impact Education Fund was recommended for funding by the review panel and neither proposal was approved for funding.

The Texas Impact Education Fund has appealed TCDD's decision to not approve funding for either proposal. Material regarding this appeal was previously e-mailed to Committee members on January 2, 2012, and is included behind this tab. The Executive Committee will review the appeal during this Committee meeting. Per TCDD Policies, the decision of the Executive Committee is final.

**Executive Committee****Agenda Item 7.****Expected Action:**

The Executive Committee will review the information provided and consider the request for appeal from Texas Impact Education Fund.

**Council****Agenda Item 14. B.****Expected Action:**

The Council will receive a report on decision of the Executive Committee.



6201 E. Oltorf, Suite 600, Austin, TX 78741-7509  
E-Mail: [TCDD@tcdd.state.tx.us](mailto:TCDD@tcdd.state.tx.us)  
Internet: <http://www.txddc.state.tx.us>

Brenda Coleman-Beattie, Chair  
John Morris, Vice Chair  
Roger A. Webb, Executive Director

TO: TCDD Executive Committee

FROM: Roger Webb, Executive Director

SUBJECT: Review of Appeal: Texas Impact Foundation Fund

DATE: January 2, 2012

---

Texas Impact Foundation Fund submitted two proposals in response to the TCDD Request for Proposals for Inclusive Faith-Based Communities projects. Both proposals were similar in overall design with one targeted to faith communities in Dallas/Ft. Worth and Houston, the second targeted to faith communities in Austin and South Texas. An independent review panel reviewed eight applications received for this RFP which authorized funds for up to four projects. The review panel recommended four of the eight proposals for funding. The remaining 4 proposals were not viewed as fundable by the review panel based on their evaluation of each proposal's strengths and weaknesses. The review panel included both proposals submitted by Texas Impact Foundation Fund among those not considered to be fundable.

The Executive Committee reviewed recommendations from the review panel for these projects during the Committee meeting November 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2011. The Committee concurred with the recommendations of the review panel and authorized funding for the four proposals recommended as fundable. Neither of the proposals submitted by the Texas Impact Foundation Fund was approved for funding.

Texas Impact Foundation Fund submitted an appeal to that funding decision which was received by TCDD November 17, 2011, asking in particular for consideration of their proposal focusing on faith communities in Austin and South Texas. This written appeal was received within the timeline required by the TCDD Policy regarding Appeal of Funding Decision. The written appeal and the TCDD Policy regarding Appeal of Funding Decisions are attached. Also attached is the summary of the Review Panel's comments.

The appeal from Texas Impact Foundation Fund expresses concerns for various findings of the review panel and provides clarification in response to some of those items by offering additional information not included in their original proposals. We note that the purpose of the Council's Process to Appeal a funding decision is to ensure that TCDD procedures were followed, and that the information provided in a proposal was reviewed fairly and objectively. The Process to Appeal is not designed as an opportunity to provide additional information for consideration when such information could have been included in the original proposal. To do so would in essence create a second review process that is not part of TCDD's current procedures.

In summary, we offer these comments in response to items in the appeal from the Texas Impact Foundation Fund (TIFF):

- TIFF comments that *"...the Panel stated in their decision letter that part of the decision not to fund us was based on what they felt was our failure to be clear that each of the proposals was a stand-alone project."* TIFF indicates in their appeal that the "submission letter" with their proposals clearly pointed out that their proposals were separate. TIFF notes separately in their appeal that the two proposals are *"identical in substance but aimed at different areas of the state"*.

The Review Panel noted as a Need for each proposal that *“The proposal would have been stronger if it had been written specifically for the geographic area of the state in which activities would occur.”* Submittal letters (cover letters) are not a required part of an application packet and are not provided to the review panel with proposals. However, TCDD’s review suggests that the review panel understood that the projects were proposed as separate projects, but felt that each proposal would have been strengthened had each had activities more specifically tailored to the characteristics of the faith communities in each of those different geographic regions.

TCDD also notes that the RFP Application Packet for this RFP details the components of a complete application. That Packet includes a Table of Contents that also serves as a checklist. A “Cover Letter” is not noted as a part of a complete application. Review panels are provided with copies of each applicant’s proposal and required attachments. Since cover letters are not part of the application packet as described in the instructions, such letters are not provided to reviewers.

- TIFF indicates in their appeal their intent to continue key aspects with or without funding, but also indicates that the symposia events themselves may not be sustainable without ongoing funding. TIFF indicated in both proposals *“If the project is successful, the changes in knowledge, attitudes and behaviors in congregations will be sustainable within the shared life of a congregation.”* Both proposals indicated a commitment to reprint and update publications as needed, subject to the availability of funding, and to maintain web content indefinitely, but did not indicate an intent to coordinate additional symposium or to provide other assistance and support to maintain project activities beyond the grant period. TCDD concurs with the reviewers concerns that a core activity of the project is to coordinate symposium as learning and sharing opportunities without which the key elements of the project are not sustained. TIFF acknowledges in their appeal that congregations will likely need continued support to sustain lasting change.
- TIFF indicates that key staff of the Coalition of Texans with Disabilities were consulted during the development of the proposals as were others with an understanding of disability issues. While they note in the proposal that *“Bryson Smith of the Coalition of Texans with Disabilities has agreed to serve on the PAC,”* there is no information included in the original proposal that indicates that people with developmental disabilities and/or their family members were involved in developing the proposal.
- TIFF provided additional information in the appeal about the background of staff related to disability issues, and expresses surprise at the Panel’s observation that no information was available about the Project Director for either project since that position(s) has not yet been hired. TCDD views the review panel’s observation about the project director for each project as an observation that since those positions were to be hired, no information was available concerning the disability related experience the director might bring to the project. And while the additional information provided concerning staff expertise is meaningful, that information was not included in the original application.
- Additional information in response to various concerns was provided in the appeal, however, the appeal, but the appeal process is not intended as an opportunity to provide additional information when that information could have been included in the original proposal.

TCDD staff reviewed the review panel process for reviews of applications submitted for the Inclusive Faith-Based Communities Symposium project RFP and found no concerns regarding procedural matters. We believe the deliberations of the review panel were fair and objective and appropriately reviewed information provided in the proposals submitted by Texas Impact Foundation Fund without bias in determining recommendations for

the Council's consideration. As noted above, the review panel's recommendation for these two proposals was: *Not Fundable*.

Based on our review of this matter, we do not see any indication of any procedural concerns in this review process. The majority of the information provided by Texas Impact Foundation Fund in the appeal was not provided in the original proposal. When reviewing recommendations from the Review Panel, the Executive Committee did not request additional information related to either proposal. We therefore have no reason to recommend considering that information further at this time and recommend affirming the Committee's original decision to not offer funding to Texas Impact Foundation Fund for other proposed project.

Attachments:

- Written Appeal from Texas Impact Foundation Fund
- TCDD Policy – Appeal of Funding Decisions
- Review Panel Summaries of TIFF Proposals for RFP #2011-4: Inclusive Faith-Based Communities Symposium



Texas Impact was established in 1973 to be a voice of religious social concern to the Texas Legislature.

RECEIVED NOV 17 2011

November 16, 2011

**Member Organizations**

**Christian Church**  
*(Disciples of Christ)*  
Bluebonnet Area  
Coastal Plains Area  
Trinity-Brazos Area  
Southwest Region

**Episcopal Church**  
Episcopal Diocese of West Texas

**Evangelical Lutheran Church in America**  
Northern Texas-Northern Louisiana Synod  
Texas-Louisiana Gulf Coast Synod  
Southwestern Texas Synod

**Presbyterian Church (USA)**  
Grace Presbytery  
Mission Presbytery  
Palo Duro Presbytery

**Society of Friends**  
South Central Yearly Meeting

**United Church of Christ**  
South Central Conference

**United Methodist Church**  
Central Texas Conference  
North Texas Conference  
Northwest Texas Conference  
Southwest Texas Conference  
Texas Conference  
United Methodist Women

**American Jewish Committee**  
American Jewish Congress  
Austin Area Interreligious Ministries  
Church Women United  
Bread for the World  
Freedom and Justice Foundation  
National Council of Jewish Women

**See Moorhead**  
Executive Director



climate and energy stewardship  
for Texas faith communities

Dear Mr. Webb,

Texas Impact appreciates this opportunity to appeal the decision of the Review Panel, which recommended that we not receive TCDD funding for our proposed project "Keeping the Faith: Building a Culture of Inclusion in Texas Faith Communities." Our proposal was in response to TCDD's RFP "Inclusive Faith-Based Symposium." Our South Texas project abstract and proposal are attached.

We proposed two projects, identical in substance but aimed at different areas of the state. We chose this approach to ensure that the resources for either project would not be spread too thin by trying to reach too many congregations. Neither proposal referred to the other; they were two separate proposals that were not dependent on each other and we clearly pointed this out in our submission letter, but the Panel stated in their decision letter that part of their decision not to fund us was based on what they felt was our failure to be clear that each of the proposals was a stand-alone project.

The Review Panel noted several significant strengths in our proposed projects, including our deep relationships within the faith community. They also indicated several areas that they characterized as "Needs." In most cases, we believe that our proposals addressed the areas characterized as Needs, so we would like to respond to those comments.

We are confused that the Panel described so many important aspects of our proposals as Strengths and then still said the project was "unfundable." We are especially disappointed that the Panel did not recommend funding our South Texas project. Congregations in South Texas are strained in many ways, and face many serious needs. They could really use the specific investment that our proposed project would provide, and our faith partners there were especially enthusiastic about the possible opportunity to do concentrated work around inclusion.

We want to stress that we have approached our proposals from within the framework of the Texas faith community, with which we are very familiar. This includes assumptions about the characteristics of local congregations; the modes of communication and outreach that faith communities employ; and the connectational networks that exist to facilitate recruitment and inclusion. In response to the Panel's comments, we are providing some additional details about these structures that we hope will clarify our strategies and assumptions.

As the Panel points out, there are existing resources that some congregations could use to improve practices related to inclusion. But time and again, experience shows that congregations require consistent support and concrete, accountable objectives

to achieve **sustainable culture change**. Texas Impact is the only organization of its kind in our state: an interfaith network of more than 20,000, with the formal support of denominational bodies and congregation-based connection numbering in the millions. We are able to provide the continuous engagement within the faith community that is required to move congregations forward. Sustained engagement, appreciation for congregational challenges and connectional relationships are truly key ingredients to realizing TCDD's hopes for the faith community.

We are eager to address the Panel's comments, and hope to convince you that our projects are fundable. We are requesting that, upon review of the information we provide in this appeal, you recommend that TCDD fund at least one of the two projects we proposed.

### **Needs Identified by the Review Panel**

- 1. There is no plan for sustainability, and the proposer indicates that they would not continue project activities without funding.**

We are somewhat confused by this comment because the proposals state that the projects are sustainable and that Texas Impact will continue key aspects with or without funding. The only component of the projects that **may** not be sustainable without ongoing funding is the symposia events themselves, but we explain that denominational bodies may want to maintain this program with their own funding, and whether they do or not, the inclusion network program will be up and running in a sustainable level by that point.

- 2. There was no evidence that people with developmental disabilities and/or families were involved in developing the project parameters or writing proposal.**

We apologize that we did not provide sufficiently detailed information about our project development process in our proposal. Texas Impact consulted with Bryson Smith and Dennis Borel from the Coalition of Texans with Disabilities in developing our proposals. We mention that Mr. Smith has agreed to serve on the PAC, and CTD submitted a letter of support for our project, but we understand that it was an oversight that we did not state in the proposals that Mr. Smith and Mr. Borel had provided expertise in the development of the proposals.

Before we even committed to developing our proposals, we consulted via email and phone with several families and pastors of individuals with developmental disabilities who are in the Texas Impact network, and we received enthusiastic support, suggestions for direction in the proposals, and commitments to participate in the PAC if invited, including from a United Methodist pastor in Austin who is the parent of an adult child with autism. However, we did not include names of any of these individuals in our proposals—since we are proposing a formal structure for establishing the PAC intended to maximize diversity, we have been careful not to promise slots to any individuals in advance of the process.

- 3. The proposer needs more detailed recruitment plans to bring in families and other organizations.**

As stated above, we will conduct recruitment through our 20,000-strong network. As we describe in our "Partnerships" section, we also will work closely with the local convening bodies of the faith community. These bodies are ideally suited to both broad-based and targeted

recruitment, and they have detailed knowledge of the families and individuals in their jurisdictions. For example, the “Districts” of the United Methodist Church have monthly meetings for clergy and lay leaders. These meetings provide the kind of forum where Texas Impact staff (or, ideally, PAC members) could make presentations, recruit congregations to participate in symposia, and learn about concerns or successes of specific local congregations that require detailed follow-up. Most faith communities have this kind of leadership forum.

In addition, many local communities host regular meetings for “religious educators,” “mission/outreach teams,” women’s ecumenical units, and other interest groups. These are important opportunities to network and recruit; more importantly, full inclusion means that people with disabilities and their families have the opportunity to participate fully in these faith-based opportunities. For example, Church Women United will need to consider how women with mental retardation are included in CWU’s programs and projects.

- 4. The staff do not appear to have sufficient background related to disability issues. The Project Coordinator has not yet been hired; this could be a person who has related experience, but this cannot be evaluated without the person in place.**

Existing Texas Impact staff have disability issue background that is not detailed in the proposals. As a Team Leader on the Texas Performance Review for eight years, Texas Impact Executive Director Bee Moorhead contributed to legislative recommendations around housing and workforce policy for Texans with disabilities and represented the Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts in interagency workgroups on disability policy. As a current member of PolicyLINK’s 15-member Community Advisory Committee on Equity, Ms. Moorhead is in relationship with experts on inclusion from around the nation and is providing leadership to the national dialogue around equity for all people regardless of race, gender, disability, age, religion or other factors.

We were surprised at the Panel’s observation that we had not hired a Project Coordinator yet, given that we had no assurance of funding. We would certainly expect the Project Coordinator to have significant disability issue expertise in addition to faith community expertise and connections. Texas Impact’s board hopes to build organizational expertise in disability policy in advance of the HHSC Sunset review and we expect to use this project as a foundational project from which to develop more robust institutional background.

Finally, from the standpoint of meeting TCDD’s needs through this project, we feel that the uniquely vital aspect of Texas Impact’s expertise is in our relationships and demonstrated success in bridging the gap between local faith communities and secular issue experts.

- 5. The proposal includes a plan to develop a “best practices” manual; this is not needed.**

We completely agree with the Panel that “reinventing the wheel” is a waste of valuable resources. As part of our project development process we investigated the resources currently available to faith communities seeking to become inclusive, and we found gaps in the available products. Our proposal envisions several products, including online and hard copy materials, and only one of these received negative feedback from the Panel; this was the manual for congregations.

Our proposed manual would address gaps in current resources in at least the following ways:

1. It will include best practices/lessons learned from Texas congregations, bringing to bear specific information useful in our state.
  2. It will be an interactive tool for Faith Based Inclusion Networks that would grow over time with input from local congregations through the project website.
  3. It will be free, accessible and easily distributable even to small and low-income congregations. Resources such as the "That All May Worship" handbook are expensive and difficult to obtain. "That All May Worship" is listed in Cokesbury (the most widely used religious bookstore) as out of print.
  4. It will be explicitly interfaith, including theological grounding from many faith traditions. Many of the resources currently available focus on the Christian community, such as "The Disability Resource Manual: A Practical Guide for Churches and Church Leaders."
  5. It will follow Texas Impact's "S-W-I-M" (Stewardship, Worship, Instruction and Mission) model of congregational engagement, which builds specific initiatives such as inclusion into the complete fabric of congregational life with attention to the liturgical year, life-cycle ministries, and functional ministries such as missions.
  6. It will be user-friendly for the local congregational team. Many guides, while useful, are long and tend to be narrowly focused such as "Welcomed and Valued." Local congregation leaders of all faiths tell us they value succinct, clear step-by-step guides that invoke Texas-specific contexts.
- 6. The proposal would have been stronger if it had been written specifically for the geographic area of the state in which the activities would occur.**

We built our two proposals around the faith infrastructures located in the geographic areas of the state where the projects would take place. Thus, for example, we focused on two districts of the United Methodist Church and the Lutheran synod in South Texas as core partners in our South Texas proposal. Each area of the state has geographic-specific challenges for inclusion, and the congregations in those areas are best able to describe their local challenges.

7. **They were not clear if the organization would have the capacity to implement one of the two projects they proposed if the other is not funded.**

As was stated earlier, we specifically did not link the two proposals in case we would receive only enough resources to carry out one of the two projects, and we stated in our cover letter that the two projects are not linked.

Thank you very much for your time and consideration.

Grace and Peace,



The Reverend T. Randall Smith, D.Min.  
President of the Board of Directors  
Texas Impact Education Fund

# ***Texas Council for Developmental Disabilities***

## **Council Policies**

### **Section X. TCDD Grant Projects**

---

#### **I. Appeal of Funding Decisions**

1. Appeals may be submitted from applicants for grants who did not receive funding or from grantees whose grants have not been awarded continuation funding. The person or entity appealing shall be known as the appellant.
2. Appeals of funding decisions shall be received, processed, and resolved with fairness and promptness.
3. The appellant shall file an appeal in writing addressed to the Executive Director. The written appeal must be postmarked within 10 workdays of the date of the written notice of suspension or within 15 workdays of the date of written notice of denial or of continuation funding. The written appeal shall include all relevant facts and information that the appellant wishes to have considered as well as the proposed remedy being sought. The Executive Director will acknowledge receipt of the letter with a copy to the Executive Committee.
4. The Executive Director will investigate, compile, and study all relevant information about the appeal and, within 30 workdays of the receipt of the appellant's letter and submit a written report to the Executive Committee. The report will contain recommended action and the evidence supporting the recommended action.
5. The Executive Committee may approve the recommendations of the executive director, make such modifications as deemed appropriate, order further investigation, or take other appropriate action.
6. The decision of the Executive Committee is final.
7. Council staff shall notify the appellant of the final determination of the appeal.



**TEXAS COUNCIL *for***  
**DEVELOPMENTAL**  
**DISABILITIES**

(512) 437-5432  
 (800) 262-0334  
 TDD (512) 437-5431  
 Fax (512) 437-5434

6201 E. Oltorf, Suite 600, Austin, TX 78741  
 E-Mail TXDDC@txddc.state.tx.us  
<http://www.txddc.state.tx.us>

Brenda Coleman-Beattie, Chair  
 John Morris, Vice Chair  
 Roger A. Webb, Executive Director

**TO:** TCDD Executive Committee  
**FROM:** Joanna Cordry, Planning Coordinator  
**SUBJECT:** Summary of Review Panel Recommendations  
**DATE:** 11/2/2011

TCDD staff convened independent review panels to review proposals received in response to 4 TCDD Request for Proposals (RFPs):

- RFP #2011-3 Leadership Development and Advocacy Skills Training Projects
- RFP #2011-4 Inclusive Faith-Based Communities Symposium
- RFP #2011-5 Enabling Technology: Collaborating for the Future
- RFP #2011-6 Health and Fitness for People with Developmental Disabilities

The panels' recommendations for funding are summarized below, and summaries of each application are attached.

**RFP #2011-3 Leadership Development and Advocacy Skills Training Projects**

**Purpose:** to create programs that provide leadership development and advocacy skills training for people with developmental disabilities, their families, and their allies.

**Funding Amount/Duration:** up to \$75,000 per year, per project, for up to 5 years.

**Number of Projects:** up to 6

<b>Leadership Development &amp; Advocacy Skills Training - Fundable</b>		
<b>Rank</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Notes</b>
1	Texas Advocates	Will provide training to residents of State Supported Living Centers
2	Texas A&M	Will provide training in public schools, focus on youth considered at-risk for dropping out
3	NAMI Texas, Inc.	Will train trainers and provide support for them to train others in their community
4	The Arc of Dallas	Will revive grassroots organization
5	The Arc of Texas	Will develop curriculum that includes best practice in community organizing
6	The Arc of the Gulf Coast	Will start self-advocacy clubs at local schools
7	Texas State Independent Living Council	Will build onto annual conference

<b>Leadership Development &amp; Advocacy Skills Training - Not Fundable</b>		

Barbara Jordan Endeavors Foundation	No additional comments
-------------------------------------	------------------------

**RFP #2011-4 Inclusive Faith-Based Communities Symposium**

**Purpose:** to develop and host 2 symposium, approximately 1 year apart, for faith-based communities to gain and share information about how to support and fully include people with developmental disabilities and their families in their communities.

**Funding Amount/Duration:** up to \$75,000 per year, per project, for up to 3 years.

**Number of Projects:** up to 4

Inclusive Faith-Based Communities Symposium - Fundable		
Rank	Organization	Notes
1	OneStar Foundation	The review panel discussed these proposals at length and could not come to an agreement that would break this 3-way tie
1	The Arc of Greater Tarrant County dba the IDD Needs Council of Tarrant County	
1	Jewish Family Service of Dallas	
4	West Central Texas Regional Foundation	No additional comments

Inclusive Faith-Based Communities Symposium - Not Fundable	
Organization	Notes
NAMI Texas, Inc.	The review panel was in agreement that the proposed project was an excellent idea and met an important need. However, it was not consistent with the intent of the RFP. The review panel strongly suggested the Council consider either supporting this organization to work with others or developing additional projects based on this proposed model.
Texas Impact Education Fund – DFW & Houston	No additional comments
Texas Impact Education Fund – Austin & S. Texas	No additional comments
The Sower Foundation, Inc.	Proposal disqualified due to missing submission deadlines.

**RFP #2011-5 Enabling Technology: Collaborating for the Future**

**Purpose:** to promote collaboration between entities to develop and demonstrate new technology, or demonstrate innovative ways to use existing technology, that enables people with developmental disabilities to gain and maintain competitive employment and/or support students with developmental disabilities to participate more fully in the classroom.

**Funding Amount/Duration:** up to \$750,000 per year, total, for all three projects combined. No project may be longer than 5 years in duration.

**Number of Projects:** up to three

<b>Enabling Technology: Collaborating for the Future - Fundable</b>		
<b>Rank</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Notes</b>
1	Educational Programs Inspiring Communities, Inc.	Will develop an application for mobile devices that will help individuals with developmental disabilities take inventory and achieve other employment goals
2	Strategic Education Solutions, LLC	Will develop a Virtual Job Coach application for mobile devices

<b>Enabling Technology: Collaborating for the Future – Not Fundable</b>	
<b>Organization</b>	<b>Notes</b>
Barbara Jordan Endeavors Corporation	No additional comments
Easter Seals of Houston, Inc.	No additional comments

**RFP #2011-6 Health and Fitness for People with Developmental Disabilities**

**Purpose:** to will demonstrate how appropriate supports may help people with developmental disabilities to participate in exercise and nutrition programs to help achieve their health and fitness goals.

**Funding Amount/Duration:** up to \$250,000 per year, per project, for up to 5 years

**Number of Projects:** up to 2

<b>Health and Fitness for People with Developmental Disabilities - Fundable</b>		
<b>Rank</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Notes</b>
1	Any Baby Can	No additional comments
2	Epilepsy Foundation	No additional comments
3	Texas Statewide Independent Living Council	No additional comments
4	Texas Tech University	No additional comments

<b>Health and Fitness for People with Developmental Disabilities – Not Fundable</b>	
<b>Organization</b>	<b>Notes</b>
AgePlan, Inc.	No additional comments
5-Star Living LLC	No additional comments
University of North Texas	No additional comments
University of Texas - Pan American	No additional comments

**TCDD Request for Proposal Reviewer Summary**  
**RFP: # 2011-4 Inclusive Faith-Based Communities Symposium**

<b>Applicant Organization:</b>	Texas Impact Education Fund (Austin) Austin & South Texas Proposal
<b>Key Project Staff:</b>	Project Director: Bee Moorhead Project Manager: to be hired
<b>Project Location (counties):</b>	Zapata, Hidalgo, Starr, Webb, Cameron and Travis Counties

**Project Abstract:**

We propose an ambitious project that will work with cohorts of faith communities in two diverse Texas regions to develop sustainable faith-based leadership models for inclusion of individuals with developmental disabilities and their families, within congregations and in the larger community. The project will result in new practices for participating congregations and serve as the basis for a nationally applicable “best-practices” publication. Participating congregation members will be educated on developmental disability issues and become effective advocates for inclusion in their local communities and beyond. The project will build on groundwork being done at the national level in many faith traditions.

**Year 1 Budget**

**Funding amount requested:      \$74,548**  
**Match:                                        \$14,445**  
**Total Project Cost:                      \$89,023**

**Strengths:**

- The proposal is well written and demonstrates knowledge and understanding of faith-based communities as well as sufficient organizational experience.
- The proposer is clearly well-connected in the public policy arena.
- The proposer has a long history of working with communities of faith, and they have strong connections with the Austin seminary and several faith groups. The organization's experience has taught them that some faith communities and their leaders would like the opportunity to learn from secular experts.
- The proposal included a sufficient discussion of barriers; more importantly, the proposer demonstrates an understanding of the need for the inclusion of people with developmental disabilities.
- The proposer understood the need for cultural competence.

**Needs:**

- The proposer needs more detailed recruitment plans to bring in families and other organizations.
- There was no evidence that people with developmental disabilities and/or families were involved in developing the project parameters or writing proposal.

- The staff do not appear to have sufficient background related to disability issues. The Project Coordinator has not yet been hired; this could be a person who has related experience, but this cannot be evaluated without the person in place.
- There is no plan for sustainability, and the proposer indicates that they would not continue project activities without funding.
- The proposal includes a plan to develop a “best practices” manual; this is not needed.
- The proposal would have been stronger if it had been written specifically for the geographic area of the state in which the activities would occur.
- They were not clear if the organization would have the capacity to implement one of the two projects they proposed if the other is not funded.

**Questions/Concerns:**

None of the proposals demonstrated a very good grasp of how much information and resources are already available. This information can be gathered by doing an internet search, and this research should be done prior to implementation of project activities. There is no need to “reinvent the wheel.”

**Final Recommendation:** Not Fundable

**TCDD Request for Proposal Reviewer Summary**  
**RFP: # 2011-4 Inclusive Faith-Based Communities Symposium**

<b>Applicant Organization:</b>	Texas Impact Education Fund (Austin) Dallas & Houston Proposal
<b>Key Project Staff:</b>	Project Director: Bee Moorhead Project Manager: to be hired
<b>Project Location (counties):</b>	Dallas, Tarrant, Hunt, Harris, Waller, and Galveston Counties

**Project Abstract:**

We propose an ambitious project that will work with cohorts of faith communities in two diverse Texas regions to develop sustainable faith-based leadership models for inclusion of individuals with developmental disabilities and their families, within congregations and in the larger community. The project will result in new practices for participating congregations and serve as the basis for a nationally applicable “best-practices” publication. Participating congregation members will be educated on developmental disability issues and become effective advocates for inclusion in their local communities and beyond. The project will build on groundwork being done at the national level in many faith traditions.

**Year 1 Budget**

**Funding amount requested:     \$74,548**  
**Match:                                 \$14,445**  
**Total Project Cost:                \$89,023**

**Strengths:**

- The proposal is well written and demonstrates knowledge and understanding of faith-based communities as well as sufficient organizational experience.
- The proposer is clearly well-connected in the public policy arena.
- The proposer has a long history of working with communities of faith, and they have strong connections with the Austin seminary and several faith groups. The organization's experience has taught them that some faith communities and their leaders would like the opportunity to learn from secular experts.
- The proposal included a sufficient discussion of barriers; more importantly, the proposer demonstrates an understanding of the need for the inclusion of people with developmental disabilities.
- The proposer understood the need for cultural competence.

**Needs:**

- The proposer needs more detailed recruitment plans to bring in families and other organizations.
- There was no evidence that people with developmental disabilities and/or families were involved in developing the project parameters or writing proposal.

- The staff do not appear to have sufficient background related to disability issues. The Project Coordinator has not yet been hired; this could be a person who has related experience, but this cannot be evaluated without the person in place.
- There is no plan for sustainability, and the proposer indicates that they would not continue project activities without funding.
- The proposal includes a plan to develop a “best practices” manual; this is not needed.
- The proposal would have been stronger if it had been written specifically for the geographic area of the state in which the activities would occur.
- It seems unlikely that the organization would be able to implement the project activities in Dallas if they do not have staff living in that area.
- The proposer would benefit from involvement of the seminaries and other pastoral training programs in the area.
- They were not clear if the organization would have the capacity to implement one of the two projects they proposed if the other is not funded.

**Questions/Concerns:**

None of the proposals demonstrated a very good grasp of how much information and resources are already available. This information can be gathered by doing an internet search, and this research should be done prior to implementation of project activities. There is no need to “reinvent the wheel.”

**Final Recommendation:** Not Fundable