

Rubric of Scoring Criteria for 21st Century Community Learning Centers

NOTE: TOTAL POINTS PER ITEM NUMBER

Student Need (20 Points Possible)			
0 Points (Weak and not fundable)	1-3 Points (Minimally Acceptable)	4-7 Points (Sufficient)	8-10 Points (Extensive/Strong)
<p>2.1 The needs assessment provides no evidence of the student need for a before and/or after school program (may include weekends, holiday and summer), little evidence of the school and community resources* available, and little documentation of how proposed program will address student needs (including needs of students with working families). The following required data is <u>not</u> included: Title programs data available from the Iowa Department of Education and data describing achievement gaps.</p> <p>The needs assessment does not summarize the transportation, safety, and accessibility needs of students or parents.</p> <p>*Take into consideration that community resources may be limited in rural communities.</p> <p><i>Consult with Iowa Department of Education before assigning 0 points.</i></p>	<p>The needs assessment provides minimal evidence that only minimally defines the student need for a before and/or after school program (may include weekends, holiday and summer), evaluates school and community resources* available, and documents how proposed program will address student needs (including needs of students with working families). The following required data <u>is</u> included: Title programs data available from the Iowa Department of Education and data describing achievement gaps.</p> <p>The needs assessment only minimally summarizes the transportation, safety, and accessibility needs of students and/or parents.</p> <p>*Take into consideration that community resources may be limited in rural communities.</p>	<p>The needs assessment provides sufficient evidence utilizing objective data that sufficiently defines the student need for a before and/or after school program (may include weekends, holiday and summer), evaluates school and community resources* available, and sufficiently documents how proposed program will address student needs (including needs of students with working families). The following required data <u>is</u> included: Title programs data available from the Iowa Department of Education and data describing achievement gaps.</p> <p>The needs assessment sufficiently summarizes the transportation, safety, and accessibility needs of students and parents.</p> <p>*Take into consideration that community resources may be limited in rural communities.</p>	<p>The needs assessment provides extensive evidence utilizing objective data that very clearly defines the student need for a before and/or after school program (may include weekends, holiday and summer), evaluates school and community resources* available, and convincingly documents how proposed program will address student needs (including needs of students with working families). The following required data <u>is</u> included: Title programs data available from the Iowa Department of Education and data describing achievement gaps.</p> <p>The needs assessment strongly summarizes the transportation, safety, and accessibility needs of students and parents.</p> <p>*Take into consideration that community resources may be limited in rural communities.</p>

<p>2.2 There is no evidence that external stakeholders, including youth, parents, community groups, and partners, were engaged in the identification of needs and development of the program.</p> <p><i>Consult with Iowa Department of Education before assigning 0 points.</i></p>	<p>There is minimal evidence that a variety of stakeholders, including youth, parents, community groups, and partners, were engaged in the identification of needs and development of the program.</p>	<p>There is sufficient evidence that a wide variety of stakeholders, including youth, parents, community groups, and partners, were engaged in the identification of needs and development of the program.</p>	<p>There is extensive evidence that a wide variety of stakeholders, including youth, parents, community groups, and partners, were engaged in the identification of needs and development of the program.</p>
Project (24 Points Possible)			
0 Points (Weak and not fundable)	1-2 Points (Minimally Acceptable)	3 Points (Sufficient)	4 Points (Extensive/Strong)
<p>3.1 There is no evidence that the proposed academic, enrichment, and family literacy/engagement activities are linked to the student needs assessment described in the “Student Need” section. No curriculum listed proposed to meet student needs.</p> <p><i>Consult with Iowa Department of Education before assigning 0 points.</i></p>	<p>There is minimal evidence that the proposed academic, enrichment, and family literacy/engagement activities are linked to the student needs assessment described in the “Student Need” section. Vague description of curriculum.</p>	<p>There is sufficient evidence that the proposed academic, enrichment, and family literacy/engagement activities are linked to the student needs assessment described in the “Student Need” section. Good description of curriculum used to link student need with academic goals.</p>	<p>There is extensive evidence that the proposed academic, enrichment, and family literacy/engagement activities are linked to the student needs assessment described in the “Student Need” section. Extensive description of curriculum used to link student need with academic goals.</p>
<p>3.2 Application does not propose a variety of 1) academic, 2) enrichment, and 3) family literacy/engagement services that fit within the eligible federal activities listed in the RFA do not appear to be of high quality and/or do not support outcomes in literacy and math. Application does not propose to provide any meal or snack.</p> <p><i>Consult with Iowa Department of Education before assigning 0 points.</i></p>	<p>Application proposes 1) academic, 2) enrichment, and 3) family literacy/engagement services that fit within the eligible federal activities listed in the RFA. Academic and enrichment activities support outcomes in literacy and math. Quality of programming and services could be improved. Application proposes to provide students a meal and/or snack that does <u>not</u> meet USDA nutrition guidelines.</p>	<p>Application proposes high-quality 1) academic, 2) enrichment, and 3) family literacy/engagement services that fit within the eligible federal activities listed in the RFA. Academic and enrichment activities support outcomes in literacy and math. Variety could be expanded, but is sufficient. Application proposes to provide students only a snack that meets USDA nutrition guidelines every day of operation.</p>	<p>Application proposes an extensive variety of high-quality 1) academic, 2) enrichment, and 3) family literacy/engagement services that fit within the eligible federal activities listed in the RFA. Academic and enrichment activities support outcomes in literacy and math. Application proposes to provide students a snack and full meal that meets USDA nutrition guidelines every day of operation. This is a</p>

			Best Practice of high quality programs.
<p>3.3 Application does not propose family literacy/engagement activities.</p> <p><i>Consult with Iowa Department of Education before assigning 0 points.</i></p>	<p>Application proposes family literacy/engagement activities, but that do not align with the needs assessment.</p>	<p>Application proposes family literacy/engagement activities that align with the needs assessment.</p>	<p>Application proposes family literacy/engagement activities that align with the needs assessment and that are likely to have a significant impact on participating students' family or the student, themselves.</p>
<p>3.4 Application does not provide goals and objectives for the activities. If offering summer programming, the program does not plan to operate for at least 30 days.</p> <p><i>Consult with Iowa Department of Education before assigning 0 points.</i></p>	<p>Application provides minimally logical, clear, and/or measurable goals and objectives for the activities proposed to meet student needs. If offering summer programming, the program operates for at least 30 days.</p>	<p>Application provides sufficiently logical, clear, and measurable goals and objectives for the activities proposed to meet student needs. If offering summer programming, the program operates for at least 30 days.</p>	<p>Application provides extensive logical, clear, and measurable goals and objectives for the activities proposed to meet student needs. If offering summer programming, the program operates for more than 30 days to support data collection.</p>
<p>3.5 Application does not explain how programming will link to school day instruction.</p> <p><i>Consult with Iowa Department of Education before assigning 0 points.</i></p>	<p>Application minimally explains how programming will link to school day instruction through relationships with school-day staff, alignment with state and national standards, or through the school's CSIP.</p>	<p>Application sufficiently explains how programming will link to school day instruction through relationships with school-day staff, alignment with state and national standards, or through the school's CSIP.</p>	<p>Application extensively explains how programming will link to school day instruction through relationships with school-day staff, alignment with state and national standards, or through the school's improvement plan.</p>
<p>3.6 The applicant has no experience in providing educational and/or enrichment and related activities to school-age children.</p> <p><i>Consult with Iowa Department of Education before assigning 0 points.</i></p>	<p>The applicant has minimal experience in providing educational and/or enrichment and related activities to school-age children.</p>	<p>The applicant has experience in providing educational and/or enrichment and related activities that will complement and enhance the academic performance, achievement, and positive youth development of school-age children.</p>	<p>The applicant has extensive experience in providing educational and/or enrichment and related activities that will complement and enhance the academic performance, achievement, and positive youth development of school-age children.</p>

Research Base (5 Points Possible)

0 Points (Weak and not fundable)	1-2 Points (Minimally Acceptable)	3-4 Points (Sufficient)	5 Points (Extensive/Strong)
<p>4 Application provides no evidence of a research base for the proposed activities. No examples of how research will be implemented into program.</p> <p><i>Consult with Iowa Department of Education before assigning 0 points.</i></p>	<p>Application provides minimal evidence of a research base for the proposed activities. Minimal examples of how research will be implemented into program.</p>	<p>Application provides sufficient evidence of a strong research base for the proposed activities. Sufficient examples of how research will be implemented into program. Citations (web, print) are provided.</p>	<p>Application provides extensive evidence from multiple sources of a strong research base for the proposed activities. Extensive examples of how research will be implemented into program. Extensive citations (web, print) are provided.</p>

Management and Sustainability Plan (20 Points Possible)

0 Points (Weak and not fundable)	1-2 Points (Minimally Acceptable)	3-4 Points (Sufficient)	5 Points (Extensive/Strong)
<p>5.1 Application does not provide a plan to ensure effective staffing. Previous grantees do not provide documentation of 5-year history with sustainability.</p> <p>Rural schools often staff programs internally and train individuals, rather than having large commitments of time from outside organizations due to shortage of personnel in all organizations and agencies in the rural communities.</p> <p>Program charging fees (this is not a best practice).</p> <p><i>Consult with Iowa Department of Education before assigning 0 points.</i></p>	<p>Application provides a minimally acceptable plan to ensure effective staffing, and includes few, if any, details specifically on recruitment and retention of highly qualified staff, professional development, strong program leadership (including how leadership will maintain alignment with school day instruction), and how the program will use volunteers (and specifically seniors) to support high-quality programming. Previous grantees provide minimal documentation of 5-year history with sustainability.</p> <p>Rural schools often staff programs internally and train individuals, rather than having large commitments of time from outside organizations due to shortage of personnel in all organizations and agencies in the rural communities.</p>	<p>Application describes a sufficient plan to ensure effective staffing, including recruitment and retention of highly qualified staff, professional development, strong program leadership (including how leadership will maintain alignment with school day instruction), and how the program will use volunteers (and specifically seniors) to support high-quality programming. Previous grantees must document sufficient 5-year history with sustainability.</p> <p>Rural schools often staff programs internally and train individuals, rather than having large commitments of time from outside organizations due to shortage of personnel in all organizations and agencies in the rural communities.</p>	<p>Application describes an extensive plan to ensure effective staffing, including good details regarding recruitment and retention of highly qualified staff, professional development, strong program leadership (including how leadership will maintain alignment with school day instruction), and how the program will use volunteers (and specifically seniors) to support high-quality programming. Previous grantees must document extensive 5-year history with sustainability.</p> <p>Rural schools often staff programs internally and train individuals, rather than having large commitments of time from outside organizations due to shortage of personnel in all organizations and agencies in the rural communities.</p>

<p><i>Reviewers should deduct points for applications who indicate they will charge fees.</i></p>	<p>Program charging fees (this is not a best practice) to parents. These programs should not exceed the first two columns for points.</p>		
<p>5.2 Application does not provide a plan for student transportation or plan to ensure safe and accessible facilities and services.</p> <p>Take into consideration that transportation arrangements in rural communities may be unique.</p> <p>It is okay for programs to have parents pick up youth if they have extended hours.</p> <p><i>Consult with Iowa Department of Education before assigning 0 points.</i></p>	<p>Application provides a minimal plan for safe student transportation to and from the program and home, where appropriate, and minimal detail regarding ensuring safe and accessible facilities and services.</p> <p>Take into consideration that transportation arrangements in rural communities may be unique.</p> <p>It is okay for programs to have parents pick up youth if they have extended hours.</p>	<p>Application provides sufficient detail of a plan for safe student transportation to and from the program and home, where appropriate, and ensuring safe and accessible facilities and services, including translation services, serving students with disabilities, and the inclusivity of program facilities.</p> <p>Take into consideration that transportation arrangements in rural communities may be unique.</p> <p>It is okay for programs to have parents pick up youth if they have extended hours.</p>	<p>Application describes an extensive plan for safe student transportation to and from the program and home, where appropriate, and ensuring safe and accessible facilities and services, including translation services, serving students with disabilities, and the inclusivity of program facilities.</p> <p>Application <u>must</u> detail how students will be safely transported to and from the program and home.</p> <p>Application <u>must</u> detail how the applicant will ensure that programming takes place in safe and accessible facilities.</p> <p>Take into consideration that transportation arrangements in rural communities may be unique.</p> <p>It is okay for programs to have parents pick up youth if they have extended hours.</p>
<p>5.3 Application does not describe the organizational and/or program leadership structure or how it will develop and engage a stakeholder advisory group.</p>	<p>Application does provide a sustainability plan but in minimal detail regarding the organizational and/or program leadership structure or how it</p>	<p>Application provides a sufficient sustainability plan that describes the organizational and/or program leadership structure and how it will</p>	<p>Application provides a sustainability plan in extensive detail of the organizational and/or program leadership structure and how it will</p>

<i>Consult with Iowa Department of Education before assigning 0 points.</i>	will develop and engage a stakeholder advisory group.	develop and engage a stakeholder advisory group at least quarterly.	develop and engage a stakeholder advisory group at least monthly.
<p>5.4A Application does not provide a sustainability plan nor does it provide a description of how resources will be combined or coordinated with the proposed program for the most effective use of public funds.</p> <p>5.4B Previously funded grantees do not document 5 years of prior sustainability. Community partners are not increased over time.</p> <p><i>Consult with Iowa Department of Education before assigning 0 points.</i></p> <p><i>Reviewers should deduct points for failure to provide a sustainability plan.</i></p> <p><i>Reviewers should deduct points for any applicant who has 10 years of funding and few community partners. These applications will receive fewer points as this is a statutory requirement of the grant.</i></p>	<p>5.4A Application provides minimal detail regarding a plan with continuous program improvement and sustainability of program following the reduction or end of 21CCLC funding and provides a minimal description of how resources will be combined or coordinated with the proposed program for the most effective use of public funds.</p> <p>5.4B Previously funded grantees must minimally document 5 years of prior sustainability. Community partners are not increased over time.</p>	<p>5.4A. Application provides a sufficient sustainability plan with continuous program improvement and sustainability of program following the reduction or end of 21CCLC funding and provides a sufficient description of how resources will be combined or coordinated with the proposed program for the most effective use of public funds.</p> <p>5.4B Previously funded grantees must sufficiently document 5 years of prior sustainability including the incremental increase of community partners.</p>	<p>5.4A. Application provides an extensive sustainability plan with continuous program improvement and resources for the sustainability of program following the reduction or end of 21CCLC funding. Provides a clear description of how resources will be combined or coordinated with the proposed program for the most effective use of public funds.</p> <p>5.4B Previously funded grantees must extensively document 5 years of prior sustainability including the incremental increase of community partners.</p>
Communication Plan (5 Points Possible)			
0 Points (Weak and not fundable)	1-2 Points (Minimally Acceptable)	3-4 Points (Sufficient)	5 Points (Extensive/Strong)
<p>6 Application does not provide the completed template or the template is incomplete in its description of the outreach strategies or activities to be employed to share evaluation and other program information. The local</p>	<p>Application provides a minimally completed template describing the outreach strategies or activities to be employed to share evaluation and other program information. Use of a website is mentioned. The local evaluation is</p>	<p>Application has provided a sufficiently completed template describing their outreach strategies and activities including the frequency, method, target audience and proposed impact. Target audiences for outreach activities include the broader community, parents, youth, and</p>	<p>Application has provided a complete and thorough template describing their outreach strategies and activities including the frequency, method, target audience and proposed impact. Target audiences for outreach activities include the broader community, parents, youth,</p>

evaluation is not made available on the program website. <i>Consult with Iowa Department of Education before assigning 0 points.</i>	not made available on the program website.	partners. Use of a website, social media, and online resources such as a program calendar are noted. The local evaluation is made available on the program website (link provided if previous grantee).	and partners. Use of a website, social media, and online resources such as a program calendar are noted. The local evaluation is made available on the program website (link provided if previous grantee).
---	--	---	---

Partnerships (10 Points Possible)

0 Points (Weak and not fundable)	1-2 Points (Minimally Acceptable)	3-4 Points (Sufficient)	5 Points (Extensive/Strong)
<p>7.1 Application does not describe existing organizational and/or programmatic partnerships or their role in programming and/or sustainability. Missing an MOU to document each partnership. Only letters of support are provided for partnerships. Fewer than five partnerships are described.</p> <p>Take into consideration that community partnerships may be unique in rural communities.</p> <p><i>Consult with Iowa Department of Education before assigning 0 points.</i></p>	<p>Application minimally describes existing organizational and/or programmatic partnerships and their role in programming and/or sustainability (references made to MOUs are allowed). Provides an MOU to document each partnership.</p> <p>Take into consideration that community partnerships may be unique in rural communities.</p>	<p>Application sufficiently describes existing organizational and/or programmatic partnerships and their role in programming and/or sustainability (references made to MOUs are allowed). 5 partnerships are described. Provides an MOU to document each partnership.</p> <p>Take into consideration that community partnerships may be unique in rural communities.</p>	<p>Application clearly and extensively describes meaningful existing organizational and/or programmatic partnerships and their impactful role in programming and/or sustainability (references made to MOUs are allowed). Provides a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) to document each partnership. More than 5 partnerships are described.</p> <p>Take into consideration that community partnerships may be unique in rural communities.</p>
<p>7.2 Application does not include a description or schedule of meetings with community partners. Missing documentation for most partnerships cited in narrative. Provides only letters of support.</p> <p>Specific meeting dates do not need to be listed. Calendars are generally</p>	<p>Application includes a non-recurring schedule of meetings with partners without adequate description of such meetings.</p> <p>Provides documentation (an MOU) for most partnerships cited.</p> <p>Specific meeting dates do not need to be listed. Calendars are generally</p>	<p>Application includes a quarterly schedule of meetings with partners with some description of meetings. Outlines a sufficient plan for engaging partners, including a plan for recruiting new partners and/or maintaining those relationships with partners. Over 5 years, program should engage 12 or more partners. Provides good</p>	<p>Application includes a monthly description of meetings and/or service on or with community group boards or committees. Outlines an extensive plan for meaningfully engaging partners over the lifetime of the grant, including a plan for recruiting new partners and maintaining those relationships with partners. Over 5 years, program</p>

created at the beginning of the school year. <i>Consult with Iowa Department of Education before assigning 0 points.</i>	created at the beginning of the school year.	documentation (an MOU) for almost every partnership cited. Specific meeting dates do not need to be listed. Calendars are generally created at the beginning of the school year.	should engage 25 or more partners. Provides comprehensive documentation (an MOU) for all partnerships cited. Specific meeting dates do not need to be listed. Calendars are generally created at the beginning of the school year.
---	--	---	---

Evaluation (15 Points Possible)

0 Points (Weak and not fundable)	1-2 Points (Minimally Acceptable)	3-4 Points (Sufficient)	5 Points (Extensive/Strong)
<p>8.1 Application does not provide evidence that an evaluator is in place and does not provide evidence of the intent to provide data or program information to the state. Evaluator will not attend training nor will s/he use the local forms provided by the Iowa Department of Education.</p> <p><i>Consult with Iowa Department of Education before assigning 0 points.</i></p>	<p>Application provides minimal evidence that an evaluator is in place and provides minimal evidence of the intent to provide data and program information to the state.</p>	<p>Application provides sufficient examples of previous local evaluations (if a prior grantee). An experienced evaluator is in place that has the capacity and experience to conduct a comprehensive, rigorous evaluation of program effectiveness, both at the local level and in cooperation with Iowa Department of Education, and the intent to provide all requested data and program information to the state.</p>	<p>Application provides extensive examples from previous local evaluations that program is successful (if a prior grantee). An experienced evaluator is in place that has the capacity and experience to conduct a comprehensive, rigorous evaluation of program effectiveness, both at the local level and in cooperation with Iowa Department of Education, and the intent to provide all requested data and program information to the state.</p>
<p>8.2 There is no evidence of how evaluation results will be used. The proposed evaluation procedures, if any, are not clearly aligned with the project's goals, objectives, and program activities. There is no detailed plan to make the evaluation results public in a form and language that is easily understood.</p>	<p>There is minimal evidence of how evaluation results will be used. The proposed evaluation procedures are somewhat aligned with the project's goals, objectives, and program activities. There is also a minimal plan to make the evaluation results public in a form and language that is easily understood.</p>	<p>There is sufficient evidence of how evaluation results will be used to refine, improve, and strengthen the program and build community support. The proposed evaluation procedures are aligned with the project's goals, objectives, and program activities. There is also a sufficient plan, including timelines, to make the</p>	<p>There is extensive evidence of how evaluation results will be used to refine, improve, and strengthen the program and build community support. The proposed evaluation procedures are clearly and strongly aligned with the project's goals, objectives, and program activities. There is also a detailed plan,</p>

<p><i>Consult with Iowa Department of Education before assigning 0 points.</i></p>		<p>evaluation results public in a form and language that is easily understood.</p>	<p>including timelines and strategies, to make the evaluation results public in a form and language that is easily understood.</p>
<p>8.3 Measure of Effectiveness for previous grantees (ESSA)</p> <p>As a previous grantee, applicant did not meet any local evaluation objectives over the past two years of funding.</p> <p><i>Reviewers should deduct points for previous grantees who did not meet half of their local evaluation objectives.</i></p>	<p>As a previous grantee, applicant did not meet half of local evaluation objectives over the past two years of funding.</p>	<p>As a previous grantee, applicant met at least half of local evaluation objectives over the last two years of funding.</p>	<p>As a previous grantee, applicant met all local evaluation objectives over the last two years of funding.</p>
<p>Budget Narrative (10 Points Possible)</p>			
<p>0 Points (Weak and not fundable)</p>	<p>1-2 Points (Minimally Acceptable)</p>	<p>3-4 Points (Sufficient)</p>	<p>5 Points (Extensive/Strong)</p>
<p>9.1 The basis for cost estimates is not described or does not include reserved funds for evaluation access, administration, or professional development; costs are not justified as necessary and reasonable; and costs do not align with proposed activities. Funding estimator was not used to calculate award. Sustainability is not documented in the budget narrative, showing the partner contributions. If charging fees, an estimate of fees (Program Income) is needed.</p>	<p>The basis for cost estimates is described minimally; costs are justified as necessary and reasonable; and costs basically align with proposed activities. The funding estimator was used to calculate award. Sustainability must be minimally documented in the budget narrative, showing the partner contributions. If charging fees, an estimate of fees (Program Income) is needed. NOT a best practice. Programs that charge fees should not receive more than 2 points, because this grant is designed for children in poverty and is intended to be free of charge.</p>	<p>The basis for cost estimates is described sufficiently and includes reserved funds for evaluation, access, administration, and professional development; costs are sufficiently justified as necessary and reasonable; and costs sufficiently align with proposed activities. The funding estimator was used to calculate award. Sustainability must be sufficiently documented in the budget narrative, showing the partner contributions.</p>	<p>The basis for cost estimates is described in extensive and concise detail including reserved funds for evaluation, access, administration, and professional development; costs are clearly justified as necessary and reasonable; and costs clearly and strongly align with proposed activities. The funding estimator was used to calculate award. Sustainability must be extensively documented in the budget narrative, showing the partner contributions.</p>

<p><i>Consult with Iowa Department of Education before assigning 0 points.</i></p>			
<p>9.2 Application does not describe how requested funds will supplement, rather than supplant, existing funding. Admin costs exceed 8% or provides excessive hours for admin costs. Failure to document sustainability can be supplanting.</p> <p><i>Consult with Iowa Department of Education before assigning 0 points.</i></p> <p><i>Align your budget with your project and management plans – failure to document this alignment could result in loss of points.</i></p>	<p>Application minimally describes how requested funds will supplement existing funding. Admin costs within 8% and admin hours within reason. Failure to document sustainability can be supplanting.</p>	<p>Application sufficiently describes how requested funds will supplement, rather than supplant, existing funding. Sufficient hours for admin and admin costs within 8% of budget. Failure to document sustainability can be supplanting.</p>	<p>Application extensively describes how requested funds will supplement, rather than supplant, existing funding. Admin cost below 8%, admin provided with in-kind, sufficient hours. Failure to document sustainability can be supplanting.</p>