|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Reader Scoring Rubric with criteria** | | | | |
| **Absolute Priority-Scored By WDE**  **Part 1-10 pts At** least 51% of schools served at Schoolwide or 40% Free and Reduced lunch eligible.  **Part 2-5 pts** Section 1116-Schools in Need of Improvement status and submitted with collaboration between and LEA and one other organization. | | | | |
| **Competitive Priorities-Scored By WDE** | | | | |
| **5 pts-**STEM programming with STEM **SMART objective, associated best practice strategies, clear action plan to meet stated outcomes.** | | | | |
| **5 pts-**Novice Applicants- No active 21CCLC award. Applicants whose last grant ended in May 2015 or earlier. | | | | |
| **8 pts-**Comprehensive program-12 hrs/week or 3hrs/day-4 days/week (minimum 24 weeks) and propose to provide at least 6 weeks of programming (4 days/week and 3 hrs/day or at least 72 hours of programming) during the summer | | | | |
| **5 pts-** College, Career, and Military Readiness Initiative-using youth development and enrichment activities, define a CCMR objective, strategies and activities based on grade-appropriate CCR skills. This can also support intervention-level content (LA and math) academies to accelerate learning for students in Core Standards for PAWS and ACT standards. | | | | |
| **8 pts-** Applicants who have at least 2 SMART objectives under Goal 3 Family Engagement that are student/family focused, incorporate You4Youth training materials, include specific activities that show innovation and expansion beyond past and current practices and that include using technology to better communicate and engage hard-to-reach parents. | | | | |
| **1) Contact Information – Subtract 2 pts if incomplete** | | | | |
| \* | At least .5FTE Project Coordinator is designated to manage the program or an acceptable rationale is given as to how the program director work will be completed using other funding sources | |  | |
| **Deductions** | | | | |
| Comments to Add into GMS: | | | | |
| **2) Applicant Information - Subtract 2 pts for each missing criteria** | | | | |
| **Criteria:** | | |  | |
| \* | Applicant is eligible, information is complete, and questions are answered. If no other funding sources are to be used with 21CCLC funds, it should be stated in the text box. | |  | |
| \* | Applicant defines current 21CCLC status | |  | |
| \* | If school district applicant-Partner with a Community-based Organization, For CBO- Partner with other local organizations to leverage funds and offer a more diverse program. | |  | |
| \* | Applicant indicates the priorities for which they qualify and provides details. | |  | |
| **Deductions** | | |  | |
| Comments to Add into GMS: | | | | |
| **3) Capacity (maximum 24 pts)** | | | | |
|  | | |  | | --- | | a) Applicant has all safety/crises plans in place (0-6pts) | | Student supervision at all times (1pt) | | Background check BEFORE working w/student(1pt) | | Weather(1pt) | | Fire & emergency/crisis procedures(1pt) | | Safe drop off & pick up(1pt) | | Parent notification re: attendance(1pt) | |  | |  | |
|  | | |  | | --- | | b) Applicant addressed transportation needs (0-3 pts) | | getting to and from the center (1pt) | | field trip information dissemination(1pt) | | bus safety training(1pt) | |  | |  | |
|  | | |  | | --- | | c) Applicant has addressed grants management capacity, including... (0-6 pts) | | training in new Uniform Grant Guidance (1pt) | | Address risk areas including internal controls, policy consistency, complaint process (1pt) | | History of compliance (only for subgrantees with fiscal responsibilities with records from Cohort 6-9 on GMS) (4 pt) | |  | |
|  | | |  | | --- | | d) Applicant has described the program supervision/hiring/staff evaluation model (0-3 pts) | | Clearly describes organizational structure (1pt) | | Describes recruiting strategies for high quality applicants (1pt) | | Has an evaluation model in place for staff (1pt) | |  | |
|  | | |  | | --- | | e) Applicant has described plan to meet data collection requirements and required partnership agreements (0-6 pts) | | Staff assigned roles in data collection (1pt) | | Data analysis happens at more than one level and frequently (3pt) | | Partnerships (at least one) is formalized, relevant to program outcomes (2pt) | |  | |
| **Total** | | |  | |
| Comments to Add into GMS: | | | | |
| **4) Population/Needs Assessment (maximum 17 pts)** | | | | |
| Relevant data substantiates that the schools are high need. 40% or more free/reduced (F&R)meals and/or have Title I targeted -assistance designation or are Schoolwide Title I, as well as having the ability to serve a large percentage of the schools enrolled students who have low proficiency on state assessments.. | | | | |
| **Criteria:** Score each criteria | | | **Score** | |
| Proposal clearly shows that the populations to be served: | | |  | |
|  | | |  | | --- | | **a) Title 1 & Schoolwide served schools…** | | At least one Title I, Schoolwide TI school, or school ≥ 40% F&R % (1 pt) **or** | | 50% or more schools **Schoolwide TI** **and/or** over 40% F&R (2 pts) **or** | | All schools served are Schoolwide Title 1 **and/or** over 40% F&R (4 pts) | | **b) Percentage of students served (participant estimate)…** | | 10% of enrollment of all schools served (0 pts) **or** | | 11-25% of enrollment of all schools served (2 pt) **or** | | ≥26% of enrollment of all schools served. (4 pts) | | **c) Academic need on 2012-13 PAWS/ MAP…** | |  15% on Rdg/LangArts (1 pt) or | | 16- 20% on Rdg/LangArts (2 pts) or | | ≥26% on Rdg/LangArts ( 3 pts) | |  15% on Math (1 pts) or | | 16- 20% on Math (2 pts) **or** | | ≥26% on Math ( 3 pts) | | **d) Additional Needs statement…(0-3 pts)** | | Clarification of the target population (2pts) | | Clarify unique needs of school/community (1pt) | |  | |
|  | |  |  | |
| *Relevant data substantiates academic underachievement in reading/language arts and/or math. School level PAWS scores and/or MAP scores from 2014-15 for PAWS and 2014-15 MAP.* | | | **Score** | |
| **Total** | | | |  |
| Comments to Add into GMS: | | | | |
| **5) Center/Site Information- Subtract 2 pts each, if incomplete** | | | | |
| **Criteria:** Score each criteria | | | | **Score** |
|  | | Centers listed match those in Typical Operations (2 pts) |  | |
|  | | Centers listed and the students they serve (grades, target groups) are clearly included in the program objectives and strategies under the Performance Goals tab. (2pts) |  | |
| **Total** | | | | |
| Comments to Add into GMS: | | | | |
| **6) Typical Operations (maximum 25 pts)** | | | | |
| Typical operations articulate a strong program with an array of highly engaging activities for a variety of age groups conducted by a trained staff. Designed for students to attend long-term as part of an ongoing program (not drop–in or intermittent sessions). Safe travel to and from the centers and home is provided if needed. Operating hours maximize the non-school (after school, holidays, and summer) time frame. Hours, days, and weeks that the program is open are based upon the needs of the families. Area location lacks high quality activities for youth. | | | | |
|  | | | **Score** | |
| Look for the following: | | |  | |
|  | |  | | --- | | a) Operating hours allow for ample **extended learning time** for the targeted student population **& serve the needs of families.** (2 pts) (**Comprehensive**) | | b) Program design reflects **coherent, ongoing** program to encourage **regular attendance (continuity of programs** regardless of topics vs. short, frequent sessions) (0-4 pts) | | c) The school year & holiday time frames maximized… | | After school (1 pt) | | before school (1 pt) | | holidays/teacher work days (1 pt) | | d) Summer Program time frames are maximized *Summer-only programs are not allowable*. | | < 4 weeks (1 pt) **or…** | | >4 weeks (2 pts) | | e) Intent to provide services to youth in K-12… | | serving K - 12 (3 pts) **or…** | | (if K - 12 district) serving K - 8 (2 pts) **or...** | | (if K - 8 district) serving K - 8 (3 pts) **or…** | | serving 7 - 12 (2 pts) **or…** | | serving K - 6 (1 pt) | | f) Provide student transport as needed. (0-2 pt) | | g) Effective academic support activities are reflected in the program description. (0-2 pts) | | h) A variety of engaging activities tied to academic outcomes are planned. (0-5 pts) | | i) Clear definition of highly qualified and how HQ is determined for applicants and supported for current staff..(0-2 pts) | | |  | |
|  | **Total** | |  | |
|  | **Comments to Add into GMS:** | |  | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **7) Program Goals, Objectives, Strategies, and Action Plans (maximum 43 pts)** | | |
| Each of the three 21st Century Community Learning Centers (CCLC) goals are listed under their own tab on the Performance Goals Tab. Applicants must provide 1) *up to* two clearly written yearly objectives for each goal and 2) *up to* three specific strategies with an aligned action plan to reach the objective. | | |
|  | | **Score** |
| Look for the following: | |  |
|  | a) **1-2 obj / goal:** Objectives are written to be student-centered and SMART [Specific, Measurable (state the measure to be used), Attainable, Relevant, and Time bound ].(0-10 pts) |  |
|  | b) 1-**3 strategies / objective:** Strategies & action plans utilize best practice research in out-of-school time that reflects a program with intent & depth, for ALL. (0-10 pts) |  |
|  | c) **Objectives and Strategies** are 1) aligned to academic and stated needs in the Population/Needs Assessment and 2) define work in all centers. (Ex. Early literacy objective but also have a HS program yet no academic objective relevant to that center.) Tab (0-10 pts) |  |
|  | d) **Strategies & action plans** are aligned/provide a clear picture of the overall focus and rhythm of day-to-day programs proposed. (0-5 pts) |  |
|  | e) Target populations are identified above each objective-targeted group(s) are specific and aligned to the goal and objective. Need not be the only beneficiary group of the effort to achieve the objective. (0-3 pts) |  |
|  | f) Professional development is described in relation to each objective. Applicant lists specific topics, Y4Y modules, training that will be facilitated during the grant year. Budget should reflect these claims. (0-5pts) |  |
|  | g) Addresses **all** students (PL 107-110, NCLB, Title IV, Part B, Sec 4201(B)(1) **(subtract 2 points)** |  |
| \*Public Law 107-110, the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, Title IV, Part B, Section 4201(b)(1) | | |
| **Total** | |  |
| Comments to Add into GMS: | | |
| **8) Program Abstract (maximum 16 pts)** | | |
| A) The project abstract includes descriptions of project purpose with alignment to 21st Century program requirements (watch for alignment with their goals and objectives), anticipated services to students and families, location, community connections, partner roles and indicators of program success. | | |
| **Criteria:** Score each criterion | | **Score** |
| Look for the following: | |  |
|  | a)Describes a discrete 21CCLC program in terms of 21CCLC goals and overall purpose whether a new program or a program within an established organization (0-6 pts) |  |
|  | b) Clearly summarizes the 21CCLC program services to students and families (not overall organization mission, etc) (0-4 pts) |  |
|  | c) Specific statements regarding numbers, targeted population(s), locations/centers, and partner roles are itemized. (0-4 pts) |  |
|  | d) Community connections and indicators of success are incorporated into the description. (0-2 pts) |  |
| **Total** | |  |
| Comments to Add into GMS: | | |
| **9) Collaboration (maximum 10 pts)** | | |
| The collaboration section outlines the communication and stakeholder engagement plan for implementing an afterschool/summer program. This includes dates and information related to the 21CCLC advisory committee, scheduled staff meetings, family engagement calendar, and regular partnership collaboration meetings for the first year of the program as describe in the Center and Typical Operations Tabs. | | |
| **Criteria:** Score each criterion | | **Score** |
| Look for the following: | |  |
|  | a) The description lists specific dates and measurable benchmarks for the engagement of stakeholders whether new or a program expansion. Descriptions in Abstract and Program goals tabs include mention of the role of stakeholders. (0-5 pts) |  |
|  | b) The frequency of collaborative activities is reasonable & designed to encompass student/family services, key professional development, advisory board meetings, & continuous improvement activities throughout the school year & summer.(0-5 pts) |  |
|  |  |  |
|  | info on communication strategies (2 pt) |  |
|  | info on key professional development (1 pt) |  |
|  | info on advisory board meetings (1 pt) |  |
|  | info on partnership collaborations (1 pt) |  |
| **Total** | |  |
| Comments to Add into GMS: | | |
| **10) Credentialing (maximum 5 pts)** | | |
| Applicants should show an awareness of the need for high quality staff through encouraging credentialing or other formal professional development. Not enough to say all staff are certified teachers. How do they show knowledge of youth development skill? | | |
| **Criteria:** Score each criterion | | **Score** |
| Look for the following: | |  |
|  | a) The credentialing plan is designed to meet the needs of new staff (1 pt) |  |
|  | ...of experienced staff/educators. (1 pts) |  |
|  | …what staff needs to learn to meet student need (2 pt) |  |
|  | …encourages staff retention and development through increases in compensation based on credentials (1 pt) |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| **Total** | |  |
| Comments to Add into GMS: | | |
| **11) Continuous Improvement Processes and Evaluation (maximum 15 pts)** | | |
| Continuous improvement processes should involve measures of both program quality as well as local quantitative measures of impact on 21CCLC program attendees. The process is described as ongoing and data driven with a focus on meeting student-centered outcomes and increasing overall program quality. An evaluation plan should be well-defined, multi-faceted, and prove to be a realistic way of evaluating both discrete activities and overall program quality and effectiveness. The first year of a grant, the new subgrantee will be trained to use the Afterschool Program Assessment System for program quality and will gather data related to student engagement. | | |
|  | a) Applicant defines a clear process of evaluation through continuous improvement using local assessment strategies (0-15 pts) |  |
|  | Describes evaluation process with clarity, ongoing continuous improvement  |  |
|  | Use of various tools to define the data picture |  |
|  | Defined roles of staff, leaders, parents in the continuous improvement process  |  |
|  | Describes how data is used to revise program activities, staff behavior, etc.  |  |
|  | Aligns program quality indicators with program quality activities/action plan  |  |
| **Total** | |  |
| Comments to Add into GMS: | | |
| **12) Partnerships (maximum 13 pts)** | | |
| The plan completely identifies all partners and clearly identifies the degree and nature of program involvement, as well as the roles and responsibilities of each partner organization. | | |
| **Criteria:** Score each criteria | | **Score** |
| Look for the following: | |  |
|  | Major Partners including subcontractors are identified and the nature of the partnership is described. (0-5pts) |  |
|  | Describes how the 21CCLC program administration will develop and formalize the new or established local and other partnerships, and if applicable, how they will ensure subcontractors perform (ex. Contract deliverables, MOU, etc) so grant awardees can maintain compliance. (0-5 pts) |  |
|  | Well thought out roles for all partners who will actively participate in this project in regards to unified 21CCLC program vision.   |  | | --- | | 1. participation in continuous improvement,(1 pt) | | 1. Fiscal processes (1 pt), | | 1. Data reporting and collection.(1 pt) | |  |
|  | Validation of lack of partnerships was included (inability to establish partnerships should not reflect negatively). (no score) |  |
| **Total** | |  |
| Comments to Add into GMS: | | |
| **13) Sustainability (maximum 6 pts)** | | |
|  | |  |
| **Criteria:** Choose one answer below, and circle the score | | **Score** |
| There is no evidence of planned sustainability. | | 0 |
| Some intention of sustainability for the continuation of the program is mentioned. | | 1 |
| Plans for sustainability of the program are referenced, but are incomplete or unclear. | | 2 |
| Plans are indicated for securing sustainability funding, but with only general reference to funding sources. | | 3 |
| Plans include evidence of sustainability funding from one or more specific sources. | | 4 |
| Plans include several sustainability options including funding and partnerships. | | 5 |
| Plans are comprehensive and articulate strong evidence of sustainability funding from one or more additional funding sources, including citation of sources and indication of timelines. | | 6 |
| **Total** | |  |
| Comments to Add into GMS: | |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **14) Budget Detail (4 pts) and Budget Breakdown (26pts)** | | |
| The budget shows how appropriate resources and personnel have been carefully allocated for implementation and maintenance of the program, as well as reasonable in relation to the number of students to be served. | | |
| **Criteria:** Score each criteria. | | **Score** |
| Look for the following: | |  |
|  | **a) Budget Detail** |  |
|  | 1) Reflects balanced (but not equal) allocations between goals (1pt) |  |
|  | 2) Items of cost in drop down menu are used appropriately-nothing is obviously missing(1pt) |  |
|  | 3) Activities align with info in Objectives & Strategies (1pt) |  |
|  | 4) Adequate number of entries to reflect comprehensive program(1pt) |  |
|  | **b) Budget Breakdown Part 1 ( up to 10 pts)** |  |
|  | Costs appear to be necessary and reasonable (0-2 pts) |  |
|  | Costs are integral to meeting/addressing objectives/strategies (0-2 pts) |  |
|  | Costs are integral to providing activities/action steps (0-2 pts) |  |
|  | Costs are integral to quality program operation(0-2 pts) |  |
|  | Instructional costs the focus of the budget; Admin costs only what is necessary (0-2 pts) |  |
|  | **c) Budget Breakdown Part 2 (up to 6 pts)** |  |
|  | Required activities are clearly itemized and described: |  |
|  | .5 FTE coordinator (1pt) |  |
|  | Family engagement budget reflects intentional, effective program activities (2pt) |  |
|  | professional development(1pt) |  |
|  | Required state 21CCLC meeting(1pt) |  |
|  | Minimum of $1,650 for APAS quality evaluation cost (1pt) |  |
|  | d) Budget Breakdown Part 3 (up to 10 pts) |  |
|  | Items of cost are allowable (1pt) |  |
|  | " are itemized (1pt) |  |
|  | " match the goal and categories in the Budget Detail (2pts) |  |
|  | personnel costs listed by position and FTE for salaried positions(1pt) |  |
|  | supplies and materials (especially small technology items) are listed and described with the purpose of determining adequacy/necessity, supplemental vs. supplant, and alignment with activities for each center(3pts). |  |
|  | contractor and other purchased services (including professional development travel costs) are itemized by vendor and accurate within the goal (2 pts) |  |
| **Total** | |  |
| **Comments to Add into GMS:** | | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Score Totals** |  |
| Section 1-Contact Info-**no points, possible deductions** |  |
| Section 2-Applicant Info- **no points, possible deductions** |  |
| Section 3-Capacity-**24 pts Possible** |  |
| Section 4-Population/ Needs Assessment -**17 pts Possible** |  |
| Section 5-Center Info- **no points, possible deductions** |  |
| Section 6-Typical Operations-**25 pts Possible** |  |
| Section 7-Objectives, Strategies and Actions-**43 pts Possible** |  |
| Section 8-Abstract-**16 pts Possible** |  |
| Section 9-Collaboration-**10 pts Possible** |  |
| Section 10-Credentialling-**5 pts Possible** |  |
| Section 11-Continuous Improvement and Evaluation-**15 pts Possible** |  |
| Section 12-Partnerships-**13 pts Possible** |  |
| Section 13-Sustainability-**6 pts Possible** |  |
| Section 14--Budget Tab-**30 pts Possible** |  |
| **Total- 204 pts Possible** | 0 |