Nebraska 21st Century Community Learning Centers Grant Program
First-Time/New Grant ◆ March 19, 2026 Application Deadline

PART 3 — SITE INFORMATION/COMPETITIVE PRIORITIES

*** To receive points as a competitive priority, for applications serving more than one school building, at least two-thirds of the schools in the consortium must meet that individual competitive priority.*

Maximum Possible Points: 50	
This grant proposal is for a site who has never held a 21st CCLC club within/partnered with the applying school building. (9 points)	
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 2025-26. (9 Points)	
Documentation is provided that the program will target students who attend schools that had a mobility rate above the 2024-25 statewide average of 3.65%. (9 points)	
Documentation is provided that the program will target students who attend schools that had a free/reduced lunch rate of at least 40% (priority points higher for 60.00+% & higher for 80.00+%) in 2024-25. *Points will be averaged for applications serving more than one school building* (40% - 7 Points 60% - 10 Points 80% - 14 Points)	
Documentation is provided that the program will target students who attend schools that had a percentage of English Learner students above the 2024-25 statewide average of 10.34%. (9 Points)	
TOTAL POINTS— COMPETITIVE PRIORITIES (50 Maximum Possible)	

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Additional Comments:

PART 4 — STATEMENT OF NEED/COMPETITIVE PRIORITIES (50 POINTS)

INADEQUATE=1 Point (Information not provided)	WEAK = 3 Points (Lacks sufficient information)	MARGINAL = 5 Points (Requires additional clarification)	GOOD = 7 Points (Clear & complete)	EXCELLENT = 10 Points (Well-conceived & thoroughly developed)

Priority Chosen: Literacy **or** Chronic Absenteeism (circle one)	
Identify the Issue: Clearly articulates the central issue or challenges at hand, demonstrating a thorough understanding of its scope, context, and significance. The identification should be precise, relevant, and provide a foundation for subsequent analysis or action.	
Provide Supporting Data: Uses qualitative and quantitative well-organized data that strongly supports the identified issue/challenge. The data is well-chosen, credible, and effectively linked to the issue/challenge being discussed.	
Describe the Impact: Provides a detailed description of the impact, addressing multiple dimensions (e.g., short-term & long-term). Demonstrates a clear understanding of the issue's broader consequences and the needed urgency.	
Connect the Need to Program Goals: Connects the identified need to the program's activities & goals, demonstrating a clear understanding of how addressing the issue aligns with the program's mission and objectives.	
Well Written & Organized: exceptionally well-written, with clear, concise, and engaging language. Ideas are logically organized and flow seamlessly from one section to the next. There are no grammatical or spelling errors. The content is highly professional, polished, and effectively communicates key information.	
TOTAL POINTS—STATEMENT OF NEED/COMPETITIVE PRIORITIES (50 Maximum Possible)	

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Additional Comments:

PART 5A — 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: 15 – Part A	
Goal 1 Narrative: Improving overall student success - 1) described the afterschool enrichment including chosen priority focus that will enhance student learning, 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.	
Goal 2 Narrative: Increasing positive behavior & social interactions - 1) indicated how the program will align with behavioral management plan and code of conduct of school day program, 2) described how staff will receive training on school day behavior management plan to provide consistency, 3) described the program initiatives that promote positive youth development, and 4) described how program activities will foster positive social interactions between students & staff.	
Goal 3 Narrative: Increasing active & meaningful family & community engagement - 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) described four family engagement activities that will be offered per year, 4) where applicable, describe opportunities (through the program or other agencies) for literacy & related educational development for families of child & youth served by the program.	
SUB- TOTAL PART 5A – (15 Maximum Possible)	

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Additional Comments:

PART 5B — 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: 15 —Part B	
Identified the membership team that will be administering the program and their commitment to meeting regularly (*required:* 4 times/year *best practice:* at least 8 times/year) and the plan to align the program 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.	
Description of the plan for participant recruitment, enrollment and retention to assure that participants reflect the school building demographics was provided.	
The transportation plan and how it met the needs of students served 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 5B—(15 Maximum Possible)	

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Additional Comments:

PART 5C — 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: 25 — Part C	
STAFFING: 1) Staffing Summary Table was complete, 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.	
COLLABORATION & PARTNERSHIPS: 1) Documentation of how the project will collaborate with partners & how they were involved in the development of the application was provided. 2) Letters of commitment from all documented partners whose contributions of $1,000 or more received. 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) Documentation of how the 21st CCLC program was carried out in active collaboration with the schools targeted students attend was provided.	
A letter of commitment is provided from each 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.	
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 4 years at a school site(s) or non-school site(s) with evidence that all requirements listed on page A-17 of the grant application will be met. 4) Description of the location and space within the building in which the activities will take place was provided. 5) Description of the location and space within the building in which the proposed renewability years 4-8 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.	
SUSTAINABILITY & FISCAL MANAGEMENT: 1) Evidence of sufficient partner/local fiscal support was provided to continue original level of services to the number of students served at full enrollment. 2) A preliminary plan for how the community learning center will continue after grant funding ends (sustainability) was described, including current, expanded and/or planned partnerships. 3) Description of investments by collaborative partners after grant funding ends. 4) The organization that will act as the fiscal agent for the grant was identified and all requested information was supplied.	
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:

Additional Comments:

PART 6 — EVALUATION

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: 25	
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 write a 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 (25 Maximum Possible)	

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Additional Comments:

PART 7A — RESOURCES/BUDGET—(ADEQUACY OF RESOURCES)

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 – Part A	
Description was provided of how the existing resources of the program site (e.g., computer lab) will be used to carry out project activities.	
A summary of the type of contributions to be made by *each* partner was provided.	
Description provided of how project will collaborate with other agencies and how 21st CCLC funds will be used with other federal, state and local programs or funds to achieve project outcomes.	
Discuss the cost per student based on the services that will be offered.	
Next two questions: **DOES NOT MEET CRITERIA = -2 Points** **MEETS CRITERIA = 0**	
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 7A—(20 Maximum Possible)	

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Additional Comments:

PART 7B — RESOURCES/BUDGET—(BUDGET)

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 — Part B	
Grantee has a partnership (local/partner funds) contributing a 1:1 match of the grant award. No point value (Y or N)	
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 (20 Points Maximum Possible)	
Total Resources/Budget Part B (20 Points Maximum Possible)	
TOTAL POINTS—RESOURCES/BUDGET (40 Maximum Possible)	

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Additional Comments:

RUBRIC SUMMARY

Section	Reviewer #1 Score	Reviewer #2 Score	Avg. Score
3: Site Information/Competitive Priorities			
4: Statement of Need/Competitive Priorities			
5: Project Design			
6: Evaluation			
7: Resources/Budget			
Total			

Summary of Comments, by Reviewer:

Reviewer #1:

Reviewer #2:

Noted Strengths and Weaknesses, by Reviewer:

Reviewer #1:

Reviewer #2:

Selected for Funding (Y or N):