

**Nebraska 21st Century Community Learning Centers Grant Program
Continuation Grant ♦ February 1, 2023 Application Deadline**

PART 4 — SITE INFORMATION/COMPETITIVE PRIORITIES

DOES NOT MEET CRITERIA = 0 Points	MEETS CRITERIA = 5 Points
-----------------------------------	---------------------------

Maximum Possible Points: 30	
This is a proposal for a 21 st CCLC Continuation grant.	
The program will target students who attend schools implementing comprehensive support and improvement activities (CSI), targeted support and improvement activities (TSI) or additional targeted support and improvement (ATSI) for 2022-23.	
Documentation is provided that the program will target students who attend schools that had a mobility rate above the 2021-22 statewide average.	
Documentation is provided that the program will target students who attend schools that had a free/reduced lunch rate of at least 60.00% in 2021-22.	
Documentation is provided that the program will target students that attend schools that had a free/reduced lunch rate of at least 80.00% in 2021-22.	
Documentation is provided that the program will target students who attend schools that had a percentage of English Learner students above the 2021-22 statewide average.	
TOTAL POINTS— COMPETITIVE PRIORITIES (30 Maximum Possible)	

PART 5 — JUSTIFICATION FOR CONTINUATION

INADEQUATE=1 Point (Information not provided)	WEAK = 2 Points (Lacks sufficient information)	MARGINAL = 3 Points (Requires additional clarification)	GOOD = 4 Points (Clear & complete)	EXCELLENT = 5 Points (Well-conceived & thoroughly developed)
---	--	---	--	--

Maximum Possible Points—20	
Evidence was provided that an effective management team (including the building principal) meets regularly at each site. Narrative included meeting dates, meeting agendas, list of attendees, or other examples that demonstrate the capacity of the management team to administer the 21 st CCLC program. The ongoing communication between the school building principal and the out of school time program leadership was documented.	
Demographics of program participants were equal to or greater than the school day demographics at every site in 2021-22. If not, the plan to improve was provided.	
A description of the <i>school district</i> financial or in-kind support to enhance or expand the program (i.e., increased financial support, additional staffing) was provided for the 2021-22 school year.	
Excluding 21 st CCLC grant funds and school district support, the <i>community partner</i> financial or in-kind support to enhance or expand the program was provided for the 2021-22 school year.	
TOTAL POINTS—JUSTIFICATION FOR CONTINUATION (20 Maximum Possible)	

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Additional Comments:

PART 6A — PROJECT DESIGN—(PROGRAM GOALS)

INADEQUATE=1 Point (Information not provided)	WEAK = 2 Points (Lacks sufficient information)	MARGINAL = 3 Points (Requires additional clarification)	GOOD = 4 Points (Clear & complete)	EXCELLENT = 5 Points (Well-conceived & thoroughly developed)
---	--	---	--	--

Maximum Possible Points—Part A--15	
Description provided of how the continuous improvement process was used to refine and improve program outcomes during the previous 4 years. For years 6-10, 11-15,16-20 or 21-25, the Goal 1 narrative 1) described the afterschool intervention, 2) indicated how the program will align with school day curriculum, 3) described the age appropriate, interesting, effective and evidence-based strategies that will positively impact this goal, and 4) where applicable, indicated how the program will align with school improvement plan of the school building.	
For years 6-10, 11-15, 6-20 or 21-25 the Goal 2 narrative 1) described the afterschool intervention, 2) indicated how the program will align with behavioral management plan and code of conduct of school day program, 3) described the program initiatives that promote positive youth development, and 4) described age appropriate, interesting, effective and evidence-based strategies that will positively impact this goal.	
For years 6-10, 11-15, 16-20 or 21-25 the Goal 3 narrative 1) described the plan to increase family's support for student's learning, 2) described how communication to and from families will be regular and purposeful, 3) where applicable, indicated how the program will align with the school improvement plan of the school building, and 4) if applicable, documented the family literacy/parent education provided by the program in year 4 and described the plan during the next five years to increase family's support for student's learning and to provide opportunities for literacy and related educational development to families of children and youth served by the program.	
SUB-TOTAL PART 6A—(15 Maximum Possible)	

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Additional Comments:

PART 6B — PROJECT DESIGN—(PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION)

INADEQUATE=1 Point (Information not provided)	WEAK = 2 Points (Lacks sufficient information)	MARGINAL = 3 Points (Requires additional clarification)	GOOD = 4 Points (Clear & complete)	EXCELLENT = 5 Points (Well-conceived & thoroughly developed)
---	--	---	--	--

Maximum Possible Points—Part B--15	
The membership team that will be administering the program and meeting regularly (recommended at least 8 times per year) was described and the plan to align it with the school day curriculum, maintain/recruit high quality staff, provide relevant professional development, conduct continuous improvement evaluation practices, as well as program and fiscal management of the grant, was provided.	
The demographics of students listed in the 2021-22 CIP Data Snapshot (school day and afterschool) were provided. (Free/reduced lunch rate of year 4 regular attendees that is at or above school building demographics = 5 points, within 10% = 3 points, if less than 10% = 1 point). Description of the plan in years 6-10, 11-15 or 16-20 for participant recruitment, enrollment and retention to assure that participants reflect the school building demographics was provided.	
The transportation plan in the prior year (how it met the needs of students served) and the proposed plan for the next five years was described, and adequately meets stated needs. If the need is met or there is no need, this was documented. A Schedule of Operation Table for each proposed site was provided, which includes total number of students to be served, organization operating site operation, collaborating partners at site, months of the year and days of the week program will be offered, daily hours of operation, and whether meals and/or snacks will be provided.	
SUB-TOTAL PART 6B—(15 Maximum Possible)	

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Additional Comments:

PART 6C — PROJECT DESIGN—(MANAGEMENT PLAN)

INADEQUATE=1 Point (Information not provided)	WEAK = 2 Points (Lacks sufficient information)	MARGINAL = 3 Points (Requires additional clarification)	GOOD = 4 Points (Clear & complete)	EXCELLENT = 5 Points (Well-conceived & thoroughly developed)
---	--	---	--	--

Maximum Possible Points—Part C--25	
<p>STAFFING: 1) Project team used in year 5, 10, 15 or 20, including the CIP evaluator and other consultants, was listed in the Staffing Summary Table, including each team member's position, name, qualifications, project responsibilities, student to staff ratio, and FTE to be devoted to the project. 2) Members of the 21st CCLC management/technical assistance team are listed by name and role, including the administrative competency they contribute to the team and the frequency of team meetings is provided. If serving more than one site, a description of the membership responsible for administration and oversight was provided. 3) Percentage of grant funds to be spent on administration versus direct services with students is reasonable. 4) Percentage of FTE of director/site coordinator(s) to oversee grant and site operations is adequate given proposed activities. 5) Description provided of how qualified senior citizens or other volunteers will be used to carry out project duties. 6) Plans for initial and ongoing training of both staff members and volunteers were provided.</p>	
<p>COLLABORATION & PARTNERSHIPS: 1) Documentation of how the project collaborated during years 1-5 with partners that signed letters of commitment in original grant application was provided. If any partners did not fulfill commitment, explanation and action taken were provided. 2) Letters of commitment in the Appendix substantiate contributions of \$1,000 or more in years 6-10 and provide evidence of prior experience or promise of success and total no less than 100% of the grant funds requested. 3) Description of how program was designed and will be implemented with input of those affected by the project was provided. 4) Description of partner's methods of communication/collaboration and delegation of duties/responsibilities or procedures for determining these, including sharing of student information, was provided. 5) Description of the capacity of the current 21st CCLC program to serve as mentor providing tech. assistance resources for other 21st CCLC grantees was provided. 6) Description of how program will help families support the learning of their children and youth was provided. 7) For years 1-4, documentation of how the 21st CCLC program was carried out in active collaboration with the schools targeted students attend was provided.</p>	
<p>A letter of commitment for years 6-10, 11-15, 16-20 or 21-25 is provided from <u>each</u> school building principal that addresses: 1) the system that will be developed to ensure that pertinent student data are shared between the school district and agencies providing services, 2) the plan for program alignment with school day curriculum at each grade level, and for individual student needs, 3) the plan for ongoing communication between project and school staff, 4) collaborative process for problem-solving, and 5) process for developing expectations regarding sharing space and equipment with the host facility and facility staff.</p>	
<p>EQUITABLE ACCESS & SITE LOCATION: 1) Documentation was provided for how the 21st CCLC program provided equitable access and participation for students, family members, teachers, and other program beneficiaries with special needs including: ELL and literacy needs, disability and non-public school youth. 2) If fees will be charged, policies/procedures assuring students will not be denied access due to inability to pay were provided. 3) Documentation was provided that the project location(s) is/are either a school building or an equally safe and accessible location. The applicant proposes providing services in the upcoming 5 years at a school site(s) or non-school site(s) with evidence that all requirements listed on page A-16 of the grant application will be met. 4) Description of the location and space within the building in which the year 5 activities take place was provided. 6) Description of the location and space within the building in which the proposed years 6-10, 11-15 or 16-20 activities will take place was provided. A letter of commitment is provided in the Appendix from each school principal or CBO director for each site, documenting that the program will have access to needed space and resources.</p>	
<p>SUSTAINABILITY & FISCAL MANAGEMENT: 1) Evidence of sufficient partner/local fiscal support in the next 5 years (100% match) was provided to continue original level of services to the number of students served in year 4 was provided. 2) A preliminary plan for how the community learning center will continue after year 10 (sustainability) was described, including current, expanded and/or planned partnerships. 3) Description of investments by collaborative partners in year 11 was provided. 4) The organization that will act as the fiscal agent for the grant was identified and all requested information was supplied.</p>	
Total Project Design Part A (15 Pts. Maximum Possible)	
Total Project Design Part B (15 Pts. Maximum Possible)	
Total Project Design Part C (25 Pts. Maximum Possible)	
TOTAL POINTS—PROJECT DESIGN (55 Maximum Possible)	

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

PART 7 — EVALUATION

DOES NOT MEET CRITERIA = 0 Points	MEETS CRITERIA = 1 Point
-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Maximum Possible Points--5	
An assurance was provided that the external or internal CIP facilitator will: 1) facilitate the self-assessment (by December 31), 2) facilitate the mid-year management team meeting (by January 31), 3) help identify and program highlight (by June 15), 4) facilitate the annual continuous improvement process meeting at each site (by September 30).	
The applicant's agreement to provide data to meet federal and state requirements in a timely manner was provided.	
The internal or external CIP facilitator that will meet the evaluation requirements was identified. If contracting with an external CIP facilitator, their qualifications and an assurance that they meet all criteria, and the amount of their compensation, were provided.	
Strategies to support project director in utilizing required database were provided.	
The management team's role in the continuous improvement process was described.	
TOTAL POINTS—EVALUATION (5 Maximum Possible)	

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Additional Comments:

PART 8A — RESOURCES/BUDGET—(ADEQUACY OF RESOURCES)

DOES NOT MEET CRITERIA = 0 Points	MEETS CRITERIA = 1 Point
-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Maximum Possible Points--5	
Description was provided of how the existing resources of the center site (e.g., computer lab) will be used to carry out project activities.	
A summary of the type of contributions to be made by <i>each</i> partner was provided.	
Description provided of how project will collaborate with other agencies and how 21 st CCLC funds will be used with other federal, state and local programs or funds to achieve project outcomes.	
A sliding scale for services for which a fee will be charged was provided, if applicable.	
If applicable, waivers are requested for: inability to partner with at least one CBO or service hours below the minimum required.	
SUB-TOTAL RESOURCES/BUDGET PART 8A—(5 Maximum Possible)	

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Additional Comments:

PART 8B — RESOURCES/BUDGET—(BUDGET)

DOES NOT MEET CRITERIA = 0 Points	MEETS CRITERIA = 1 Point
-----------------------------------	--------------------------

Maximum Possible Points—Part B--5	
The budget summary and justification are complete, detailed, and free of errors.	
1)Justification for grant fund expenditures provided detail and itemization and is reasonable. 2) Justification for partner/local fiscal support provided detail and itemization.	
Mandatory budget items (student transportation, accommodations for special needs students, and staff development) are included in either the grant funds requested or partner/local fiscal support section.	
Budget included partner/local fiscal support at least equal to the grant funds requested.	
1)Restricted cost items, if budgeted, were within allowable limits. 2) No non-allowable costs were included in the budget.	
Total Resources/Budget Part A (5 Points Maximum Possible)	
Total Resources/Budget Part B (5 Points Maximum Possible)	
TOTAL POINTS—RESOURCES/BUDGET (10 Maximum Possible)	

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Additional Comments: