2022-2023 Application/Scoring Review Rating Form

Reader's Name	
Reader's Address/Phone/Email	
Applicant School District	
Applicant Agency/CBO/FBO	

I affirm that to the best of my knowledge and belief, I am not involved in any activity and have no outside interests that conflict or suggest a potential conflict with the best interests of the applicant: _____ _____

<div align="center">(e-signature)   (date)</div>

Reader Instructions: Give the proposal a score that best describes its attributes in each category.
Give the proposal a subtotal as indicated at the end of each section. Total all the subsections in the final scoring chart below.

Total Score of this proposal is _____ Maximum points: 120

TOTAL SCORING CHART

CATEGORY	MAX POINTS	POINTS SCORED
Complete Application	2.5	
a. Priority Points		
Middle or High School	5	
New Grant	5	
Career Exploratory Activities	3	
Work Based Learning	7	
b. Abstract	2.5	
c. Planning Process	5	
d. Need for Project	10	
e. Program Design	20	
f. Adequacy of Resources	10	

2022-2023 Application/Scoring Review Rating Form

g. Program Management Plan	10	
h. Project Evaluation	20	
i. Budget/Budget Narrative	10	
j. Collaboration, Partnerships, Advisory Board, and Sustainability	10	
TOTAL	**120**	

COMPLETE APPLICATION

	YES	NO
Application Cover Page is included with appropriate signatures.	☐	☐
The Application Checklist is included.	☐	☐
Table of Contents is included.	☐	☐
A one page Abstract is included.	☐	☐
The proposal is clearly labeled per directions in RFA.	☐	☐
Narrative and attachments follow formatting and page limits as outlined in the RFA.	☐	☐
Appendices are tabbed and labeled.	☐	☐
Scoring: All elements complete – 2.5 pts. For each missing element, deduct .5 points.	**Total Possible: 2.5 pts.**	**Total No's:** _____
Points Calculation	**2.5 points** ▬ _____ = _____ _Total No's_ _Final Score_	_Cannot be less than zero_

2022-2023 Application/Scoring Review Rating Form

COMPETIVE PRIORITY POINTS

	No	Yes
Evidence that the application targets Middle school or High school students (5 points)	0	5
Applications from 1st time (new) grant applicants (5 points)	0	5
Evidence applicant has partnered with or provided career exploratory activities (3 points)	0	3
Evidence that the applicant has included work based learning (WBL) in their application (7 points)	0	7
SUBTOTAL (Max. 20 points):		

2022-2023 Application/Scoring Review Rating Form

A. PLANNING PROCESS

	Weak Response	**Marginal Response**	**Good Response**	**Comments**
Planning process	One person writing in complete or near complete isolation. (0 pt.)	Working with a small group or team to develop plan. (1 pt.)	A variety of stakeholders and partners meet regularly to develop a plan. Evidence of diverse planning of activities. (1.5 pts.)	
Community was provided notice	No records of community being informed. (0 pts.)	Community was notified of the planning. (.5 pts.)	Community was notified and included to be part of the planning. (1 pt.)	
Collaboration between LEA & CBO, FBO, etc.	Common meeting times with partners is limited. (0 pts.)	Meetings include various partners and leaders. (1 pt.)	Evidence shows partners and leaders have participated in the details of the planning. (1.5 pts.)	
Private school consulting	Does not include information regarding private schools. (0 pts.)	Private schools were notified of the plan. Attachment of responses are included. (.5 pts.)	Private schools representatives were included in all phases of the application development. Evidence that representatives had opportunities to express their views. Attachment of responses are included. Appendix G, ESEA Equitable Services Affirmation document is provided. OR Clearly states there are no private schools in the district. (1 pt.)	
SUBTOTAL (max. 5 points)				

B. NEED FOR PROJECT

	Weak Response	Marginal Response	Good Response	Comments
Provides a description of their community, explaining why the proposed project is appropriate, supported by a needs assessment of the 21st CCLC program in the community.	Does not provide a description of their community, explaining how the proposed project is appropriate for the program (0 pts.)	Does not provide a description of their community and/or explain how the proposed project is appropriate for the program (1 pt.)	Clearly provides a description of their community, explaining why the proposed project is appropriate, supported by a needs assessment of the 21st CCLC program in the community. (2 pts.)	
Cites community factors that place target populations at risk of educational failure and community need.	Does not include risks for educational failure. Does not show the community need. (0 pts.)	Includes limited details for educational risk of failure and community need. (1 pt.)	Details include both educational failure and community need. (2 pts.)	
Assessment of objective data regarding the need for before and afterschool programs are provided. Detailed results are included.	Little data connecting the need and the proposal. (0 pts.)	Need of program is stated yet little or no data is shown. (1 pt.)	Showcases need with strong details for how the community was assessed, including results. (2 pts.)	
Description of meeting the needs of the students & families.	The plan does not include meeting the needs of the students & families. (0 pts.)	There is little evidence the students & families needs are being met. (1 pt.)	Clearly shows evidence that includes students & families needs in the design of programming. (2 pts.)	
Description of other afterschool programs currently serving the target population and provides why their services are insufficient to meet identified needs.	Little or no description of current programs serving target population. (0 pt.)	Includes other programs in community yet lacks details of insufficient services. (1 pt.)	Describes the services provided to target population and includes areas of need of additional services. (2 pts.)	
SUBTOTAL (max. 10 points)				

C. PROGRAM DESIGN

	Weak Response	**Marginal Response**	**Good Response**	**Comments**
Describes how the program will align and link to the school day for academic assistance and enrichment programs.	Alignment to the school day is minimal or non-existent. (0 pts.)	Alignment with the school day support to programming is not clearly defined. (.5 pts.)	It is clear how the program will align with and support the school day, gave examples. (1.5 pts.)	
Describes how academic needs will be identified and supported through the program. Includes any current or intended connections to school/district improvement plans, graduation requirements, LEA comprehensive needs assessments, and school wide Title I or other state/federal plans. Describes how the program will accommodate students with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs), and/or 504 plans.	Does not identify how academic needs will be identified and supported. Does not address how the program will accommodate students with IEPs and/or 504 plans. (0 pts.)	Identifies how academic needs will be identified and supported. Does not address how the program will accommodate students with IEPs and/or 504 plans (.5 pts.)	Clearly identifies how academic needs will be identified and supported. Clearly addresses how the program will accommodate students with IEPs and/or 504 plans (1.5 pts.)	
Describes how the program will accommodate students and families whom English is a second language.	Does not describe how the program will accommodate students and families whom English is a second language. (0 pts.)	Does not clearly describe how the program will accommodate students and families whom English is a second language. (.5 pts.)	Clearly describes how the program will accommodate students and families whom English is a second language (1.5 pts.)	
Describes how the LEA ensures equitable access for students and teachers to participate in the 21st CCLC federally assisted programs.	Does not include information about equitable access. (0 pts.)	Includes minimal information for equitable access for 21st CCLC. (.5 pts.)	Equitable access for all students is clearly defined. (1.5 pts.)	
Describes how the target group will be identified, how selections will occur and how invitations will be extended. Shows how the selection criteria are aligned with the population's needs as described in the Need for Project section and with the intended outcomes.	Does not describe how the target group will be identified and how selections will be extended. Does not show how selection criteria are aligned with the population's needs (0 pts.)	Does not clearly describe how the target group will be identified and how selections will be extended. Does not clearly show how selection criteria are aligned with the population's needs. (1 pt.)	Clearly describes how the target group will be identified and how selections will be extended. Clearly shows how selection criteria are aligned with the population's needs. (2 pts.)	

Describes the safety (including physical and/or social-emotional) practices and protocols that will be followed for afterschool programing.	There is limited information on the safety practices and protocols. (0 pts.)	Safety practices and protocols do not address physical and/or social-emotional needs. (.5 pts.)	Safety (including physical and/or social-emotional) practices and protocols that will be followed for afterschool programing are described. (1.5 pts)	
Describes plans to monitor attendance and how parent feedback will inform the continued development of the program. **Current Grantees –** Completed table to include the numbers of youth and families served each year of the original five year grant. Includes and explains any fluctuation of the numbers of youth and families that were served for each year. Describes strategies to increase enrollment and/or retain enrollment	Does not describe plans to monitor attendance and how parent feedback will inform the continued development of the program. Current grantees did not complete the table and/or explain any fluctuations in numbers served and describing strategies to increase enrollment. (0 pts.)	Does not clearly describe plans to monitor attendance and how parent feedback will inform the continued development of the program. Current grantees completed the table and did not clearly explain any fluctuations in numbers served and describing strategies to increase enrollment. (1 pt.)	Clearly described plans to monitor attendance and how parent feedback will inform the continued development of the program. Current grantees completed the table and clearly explained any fluctuations in numbers served and describing strategies to increase enrollment. (2 pts.)	
Describes the specific program activities; how they link to the needs identified in the Need for Project section and how they contribute to academic achievement and youth development including how they fit within the Schedule of Operations (Appendix D). Included how activities are expected to improve student learning and referenced any evidence-based research. **High school applicant**- Describes activities, strategies, and coordination of the NH's High School Extended Learning Opportunities (ELOs). Describes the guidelines to a program menu that includes credit bearing ELOs and non-credit programming.	Did not describe the specific program activities and how they linked to the needs identified. Did not include a schedule of operations. HS programs did not address activities, strategies and coordination of ELOs. (0 pts.)	Did not clearly describe the specific program activities and how they linked to the needs identified. Did not include a schedule of operations. HS programs did not address activities, strategies and coordination of ELOs. (.5 pts.)	Clearly described the specific program activities and how they linked to the needs identified. Included a schedule of operations. HS programs clearly addressed activities, strategies and coordination of ELOs. (1.5 pts.)	
Describes how youth voice will inform the continued development of the program.	There is little evidence a youth voice approach is used or considered. (0 pts.)	Youth voice approach is evident, but not central to programming. (.5 pts.)	A youth voice approach is clearly articulated in detail. (1.5 pts.)	

Describes how the program will create a welcoming environment for families.	Little or no details of welcoming environment. (0 pts.)	Details of welcoming environment disconnected to programming. (.5 pts.)	The program is clearly connected to a welcoming environment. (1.5 pts.)	
A schedule for each proposed site is included (minimum days and hours of operation, academic support and enrichment choices).	Schedule does not include minimum days and hours or operation or academic support and enrichment. (0 pts.)	Meets minimum days and hours yet academic support and enrichment planning is not clear. (1 pt.)	Meets minimum days and hours and clearly defines program plans for academic support and enrichment choices. (2 pts.)	
Describes the fees being charged, if any. If fees are being charged, details regarding the clearly defined sliding scale fee, as well as its administration and management are addressed. The parent fees table on Appendix C is attached.	The fee structure and justification is not clear. Table is not attached. (0 pts.)	The fee structure is not clearly defined. Does not have a sliding scale fee, or is not justified. Does not clearly include how fees will be used. (1 pt.)	The fee structure is clearly defined, includes sliding scale fees, and includes use of funding. The fees are justified and parent fees table is provided. (2 pts.)	
SUBTOTAL (max. 20 points)				

D. ADEQUACY OF RESOURCES

	Weak Response	**Marginal Response**	**Good Response**	**Comments**
Describes staffing for proposed programs and student-to-staff ratios based on guidance in RFA. *High School applications include who will coordinate credit bearing ELOs and non-credit programming and describes how it will be done.*	Minimal details of staffing for various activities. Staff to student ratios are not clearly identified. (0 pts.)	States they will meet staff to student ratios with minimal details connected to proposed program. (.5 pt.)	Clearly defines all staffing connected to proposed programming meeting staff to student ratios. (1 pts.)	
Describes how staff will be selected, trained & supervised	Does not include all of the areas (selection, training, supervision) (0 pts.)	Some details are included, yet is lacking details for some staff. (.5 pt.)	Clearly explains the process for selecting, training and supervision of all staff. (1 pts.)	

2022-2023 Application/Scoring Review Rating Form

Describes job descriptions, credentials of staff roles and requirements. Program director role is included.	The program is limited in scope and staffing qualifications are not specified or are weak. (0 pts.)	The proposal constitutes a diverse staffing approach. (.5 pt.)	Staff is highly qualified. The program plans to employ a number of school day professionals and contains a diverse staffing approach. (1 pts.)	
Describes engagement with volunteers including how senior citizens will be used to support activities, if applicable.	There is no plan to engage volunteers. (0 pts.)	The plan is limited on engaging volunteers. (.5 pts.)	The plan has a variety of ways to engage volunteers. (1 pt.)	
Describes relevant screening process (background checks and/or fingerprinting) procedures.	There is little to no evidence that clearance procedures are in place. (0 pts.)	Clearance procedures do not have a clear implementation plan. (.5 pts.)	Clearly defines how the clearance procedures will be implemented. (1 pt.)	
Explains how specific organizational leadership supports the organization and partnerships to assure project success. Describes expectations that will be set by leadership with regards to lesson planning, course development, pedagogy and integration.	Does not explain how leadership supports the organization and partnerships. Does not describe expectations set by leadership (0 pts.)	Lacks explanation of how leadership supports the organization and partnerships. Lacks expectations set by leadership (1 pt.)	Clearly explains how leadership supports the organization and partnerships. Clearly describes the expectations set by leadership (2 pts.)	
Describes how trainings and professional development will be linked to the needs of the staff. Describes the types of professional development linked to high quality programming & continuous improvement.	There is no professional development plan. (0 pts.)	Professional development plan is in place but does not address the needs and/or does not clearly link to quality and continuous improvement. (1 pt.)	High quality and continuous improvement is directly linked to professional development and addresses the staff needs. (2 pts.)	
Includes staff attending state, local and national trainings/conferences.	Unclear on who and how often staff will attend trainings and conferences. (0 pts.)	Proposal includes that they will attend trainings and conferences, yet lacks any details. (.5 pt.)	A clear plan of who and what trainings and conferences will be attended. (1 pts.)	
SUBTOTAL (max. 10 points)				

E. PROGRAM MANAGEMENT PLAN

	Weak Response	Marginal Response	Good Response	Comments

Attached timeline includes program implementation, continued planning, youth voice, parent input, family literacy, professional development and evaluation.	The timeline lacks details and is not connected to the program needs and plan. (1 pt.)	The timeline includes necessary elements yet lacks connection to continuous improvement. (2 pts.)	The timeline connects to the program needs, plans and builds in plans for continuous improvement. (3 pts.)	
Describes the structure and process that includes clear ongoing communication and linkage with all stakeholders. *School Board policy for High School ELOs is attached. If not, the timeline and process for completion is described.*	It is not clear how ongoing communication and linkage with all stakeholders will be implemented. (1 pt.)	The plan has details of how they will provide communication yet lacks details of stakeholders' involvement & engagement. (2 pts.)	A system of integrated communication strategies are planned to be implemented with stakeholder engagement. (3 pts.)	
The plan to disseminate information includes the; name, 21st CCLC logo, location, etc. to the community in an ongoing manner that is understandable and accessible. If materials need to be translated, this is addressed.	There is no plan on dissemination of information. (0 pts.)	There are little details on how the dissemination plan will be accessible to the community. (1 pt.)	There is a clearly defined plan to disseminate information in multiple ways. (2 pts.)	
Location of 21st CCLC, including accessibility.	Does not include details of accessibility. (0 pts.)	Unclear of the accessibility. (1 pt.)	Clearly explains the accessibility. (2 pts.)	
SUBTOTAL (max. 10 points)				

F. PROGRAM EVALUATION

	Weak Response	Marginal Response	Good Response	Comments
Completed Appendix E GPRA Measures template; how they will achieve the set State goals and what their expected outcomes will be.	Did not provide information on how they will achieve the State goals and what outcomes to expect. (0 pts.)	Lacked information on how they will achieve the State goals and what outcomes to expect. (3 pt.)	Provided information on how they will achieve the State goals and what outcomes to expect. (4 pts.)	
Identifies who will be responsible for data compilation and analysis. And Describes how the project will use best practices, including research or evidence-based practices, to provide educational and related activities complementing and enhance	Did not identify who will be responsible and did not describe how the project will use best practices. (0 pts.)	Did not clearly identify who will be responsible for data compilation and analysis and did not clearly describe how the project will use best practices.	Clearly identified who will be responsible will be for data compilation and analysis and did clearly describe how the project will use best practices. (3 pts.)	

	Weak Response	Marginal Response	Good Response	
academic performance in state assessments (NHSAS), grade point average, school day attendance, teacher-reported behaviors and student engagement in learning.		(2 pt.)		
Describes how these best practices will positively influence student outcomes in their program.	Did not identify how these best practices will positively influence student outcomes in their program. (0 pts.)	Lacked details of how these best practices will positively influence student outcomes in their program. (3 pt.)	Clearly details how these best practices will positively influence student outcomes in their program. (4 pts.)	
Describes how the evaluation information will be used to provide feedback to stakeholders and staff and inform project direction. It is connected to the data collected in the GPRA Measures template.	There is little evidence that data is used for best practices, research and continuous improvement. (0 pts.)	Performance measures including feedback are part of the plan and somewhat linked to continuous improvement. (2 pt.)	The plan utilizes the evaluation information and feedback from stakeholders for program improvement clearly designed through a continuous improvement plan. (3 pts.)	
Describes the system that will be developed to ensure pertinent student data, including academic records, are shared between the school district and agencies providing services. Includes an MOU or communication plan for data sharing.	It is not clear on how data will be collected and shared for student improvement. Did not include a MOU or communication plan for data sharing. (0 pts.)	There is a plan in place on how data will be collected and shared for student improvement. Did not include a MOU or communication plan for data sharing. (2 pt.)	A detailed plan of shared data including roles and responsibilities for collecting and protecting data is described. Included within the MOU or communication plan for data sharing (3 pts.)	
A brief summary of any evaluation studies, reports or research from program or partners that document evidence of previous success or promise of success are included.	Little to no evidence supporting the promise of the designed program success is included. (0 pts.)	There are details of evidence discussing how a program can be successful yet is lacking specific details this project. (2 pt.)	The summary clearly links evidence to the planned project utilizing research, best practices. (3 pts.)	
SUBTOTAL **(max. 20 points)**				

G. BUDGET/BUDGET NARRATIVE

	Weak Response	**Marginal Response**	**Good Response**	**Comments**

2022-2023 Application/Scoring Review Rating Form

Attached budget spreadsheet(s) is detailed and includes required items.	Costs are not clear and do not relate explicitly to the proposal. The budget is not meeting guidelines and the budget does not define reasonable cost per pupil. (0 pts.)	The costs are reasonable, balanced and for the most part tied to the proposal. (1 pt.)	The budget is reasonable, clear, and convincing, per participant cost are within guidelines and the budget can successfully and reasonably implement the proposal. (2 pts.)	
Budget narrative is detailed and includes all items in the budget.	Not enough details and doesn't include all items. (0 pts.)	Includes all specific line items based on programming yet lack sufficient details. (1 pt.)	The budget is detailed in all areas, including specific activities and supplies. (2 pts.)	
Provides evidence that there is a commitment of adequate resources for all attendees.	The budget does not include adequate resources for all attendees or is not clear. (0 pts.)	The resources seem limited or excessive in some areas supporting the attendees. (.5 pt.)	The budget is clearly defined to effectively and not excessively meet the needs of all attendees. (1 pts.)	
Provides evidence that there is a commitment of adequate resources for transportation.	Transportation costs do not align to needs of participants. (0 pts.)	The cost of transportation is not clear. (.5 pts.)	Adequate resource and costs for transportation align with participant needs. (1.5 pts.)	
Provides a detailed narrative explaining the anticipated revenues from other sources to be collected throughout the school year identifying and describing each type of program income.	Does not detail anticipated revenues from other sources to be collected throughout the school year. (0 pts.)	Included anticipated revenues from other sources without a description of each type of program income. (.5 pts.)	Anticipated revenues from other sources to be collected throughout the school year are identified and each type of program income is described. (1.5 pts)	
Identifies federal, state, and local programs that will be combined or coordinated with the proposed program for the most effective use of public resources (e.g., Juvenile Justice Funds, Title I, Incentive Funds, etc.).	Does not identify federal, state, and local programs that will be combined or coordinated with the proposed program for the most effective use of public resources. (0 pts.)	It is unclear how federal, state, and local programs will be combined or coordinated with the proposed program for the most effective use of public resources. (1 pt.)	Federal, state, and local programs are identified, that will be combined or coordinated with the proposed program for the most effective use of public resources. (2 pts.)	
SUBTOTAL **(max. 10 points)**				

H. COLLABORATION, PARTNERSHIPS, ADVISORY BOARD, SUSTAINABILITY

	Weak Response	**Marginal Response**	**Good Response**	**Comments**
Attached letter(s) of support from principal(s).	No letters of support are included. (0 pts.)	Does not include letters of support from each principal. (.5 pt.)	Includes letter of support from each principal. (1 pts.)	
Detailed description of each partnership, clearly indicates roles and capacity of each partnerships.	List of partners included, lacking details, roles and capacity. (0 pts.)	Detailed description of partners yet does indicate roles and capacity of partners. (.5 pt.)	Detailed description of partners indicating roles and capacity of all partners. (1 pts.)	
Attached MOU for each partner.	Missing one or more MOU(s). (0 pts.)	MOU(s) are attached yet details are not clear. (.5 pt.)	MOU(s) are attached clearly defining the partnership roles. (1 pts.)	
Describes how the advisory board members represent the diverse needs of community.	Advisory board is not diverse to meet community needs. (0 pts.)	The advisory board is lacking diversity based on the needs of the community. (.5 pt.)	The advisory board is designed to meet the needs of the community including a diverse representation. (1 pts.)	
Describes the roles and responsibilities of the Advisory Board.	The roles of the advisory board are not clear and don't align to supporting programming. (0 pt.)	The roles and responsibilities of the advisory boards are clearly defined but are not clearly link to program development. (.5 pt.)	The advisory board roles and responsibilities include engagement in planning, developing and sustaining the program. (1 pts.)	
Documents that Advisory Board meetings will occur a minimum of three times per year (beginning, middle, and end).	The meeting times of the advisory boards are not clearly documented. (0 pts.)	There are timeframes of advisory board meetings but not linked to the timeline. (.5 pts.)	The advisory board meetings are planned and are part of the timeline required to meet the needs of proposal. (1 pts.)	
Sustainability Plan explains role and involvement of advisory board members (states name and/or organizations when appropriate).	Sustainability plan is lacking details of roles and involvement. (0 pts.)	More clarity is needed in regards to how the roles and involvement are connected to help sustain the program. (1 pt.)	A clearly defined plan has been developed engaging community members with set roles and responsibilities. (2 pts.)	
The sustainability plan offers viable opportunities for continued sustainability (diverse resources & funding).	The plan has little or no details of how the program will offer opportunities for	The plan includes viable opportunities yet is lacking	The plan includes diverse opportunities for funding and	

2022-2023 Application/Scoring Review Rating Form

Current subgrantees applicants discuss steps they have taken to sustain the program without the grant.	sustainability beyond five years. (0 pts.)	some diverse resources or other funding. (1 pt.)	resources with a variety of options. (2 pts.)	
SUBTOTAL **(max. 10 points)**				