



GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES VIRGIN ISLANDS

DEPARTMENT OF
EDUCATION

Division of Procurement

1834 Kongens Gade, Charlotte Amalie
St. Thomas, U.S. Virgin Islands 00802-6746
Tel: (340) 774-0100 ext. 8211
khadila.joseph@vide.vi
www.vide.vi

Khadila D. Joseph
Director

RFP-DOE-2021-008
21st Century Community Learning Centers Grant Program
Addendum No. 3

Please see attached Scoring Criteria.



SCORING RUBRIC

21st Century Community Learning Centers (21st CCLC) Program

Application #: _____

Name of Applicant: _____

Reviewer's

Initials: _____

Date of Review: _____

Directions: Please indicate the appropriate point values and place the total score in the last column for each selection criteria as listed in the RFP. Additionally, please write comments regarding specific strengths and weaknesses for each criterion. Each criterion should have a minimum of one substantive comment for each strength and weakness. Whenever possible, and as appropriate, please indicate a specific page number to illustrate this citation.

CRITERIA 1: PROJECT ABSTRACT (NO POINTS)

SCORING CRITERIA	EXCELLENT (well conceived, thoroughly developed)	GOOD (clear and complete)	MARGINAL (requires additional clarification)	WEAK (lacks sufficient information)	INADEQUATE (information not provided)
1. The applicant provides a brief summary of the project that describes the community needs being addressed.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Is there a summation of the key elements and overall purpose of the proposed 21st CCLC program?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL POINTS (out of 0 points)	0				

STRENGTHS

Applicant provided a clear and detailed description of the needs of the community and students. The applicant did not provide any elements or information of the purposed of the proposed 21st CCLC program within the Abstract.

WEAKNESSES

CRITERIA 2: NEEDS ASSESSMENT (15 POINTS MAX)

In accordance with P.L. 107-110 Sec. 4204(b)(2)(I), each application must demonstrate that they have identified specific community needs and available resources for the community learning center and describe how the proposed program will address those needs, including the needs of working families.

SCORING CRITERIA	EXCELLENT 5 Points (well conceived, thoroughly developed)	GOOD 4 Points (clear and complete)	MARGINAL 3 Points (requires additional clarification)	WEAK 2 Points (lacks sufficient information)	INADEQUATE 0 Points (information not provided)
1. The applicant provides a description of the applicant community and the extent to which the proposed project is appropriate to, and successfully address the needs of the target population.					
2. The applicant provides a detailed description of the needs of students at risk of educational failure in the targeted community, including relevant data and statistics for students, community, and family members.					
3. The applicant included an adequate detailed description of how the proposed project will help to remedy the risk factors (needs) that have been identified.					
SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL POINTS (out of 15 points)	0				

STRENGTHS

The applicant did provide great detail on student performance levels (56% below standard for literacy, 72% below for math, 7% increase in dropout, 59% of children are from single parent families that are unable to afford childcare, and stats on Substance Abuse). The applicant provided in detail how the proposed program will address each need.

WEAKNESSES

The applicant did not provide a great detail of why the certain apartment complexes were used as their target areas (i.e. The apartment complex was selected because of majority of the children in need reside here or the % of low-income/low-achieving students).

CRITERIA 3: QUALITY OF PROJECT DESIGN (90 POINTS MAX)

In accordance with P.L. 107-110 Sec. 4201 (a), each application will be evaluated based on the extent to which it is able to clearly and specifically explain how the key instructional practices and major design elements of the program are able to (1) provide academic enrichment to help students meet State and local student academic achievement standards in core academic subjects such as reading, mathematics and science; (2) offer students a broad array of services that are designed to reinforce and complement the regular academic program of participating students; and (3) offer families of students served by community learning centers opportunities for literacy and related educational development.

SCORING CRITERIA	EXCELLENT 5 Points (well conceived, thoroughly developed)	GOOD 4 Points (clear and complete)	MARGINAL 3 Points (requires additional clarification)	WEAK 2 Points (lacks sufficient information)	INADEQUATE 0 Points (information not provided)
1. The applicant provided a description of the partnership between a local educational agency or school, community-based organization(s) or another public or private organization.					
2. The applicant included goals and objectives that are aligned with the performance standards in core academic subjects.					
3. The applicant identifies the target population, including the number of students to be served.					
4. The applicant addresses the needs of the target population.					
SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0
	EXCELLENT 10 Points (well conceived, thoroughly developed)	GOOD 8 Points (clear and complete)	MARGINAL 5 Points (requires additional clarification)	WEAK 2 Points (lacks sufficient information)	INADEQUATE 0 Points (information not provided)
5. The applicant offers a literacy component as part of the academic offering of the program and includes small group instruction for low-achieving students using strategies consistent with a framework for language arts or research-based literacy practices.					
6. The applicant offers a math and science component as part of the academic offering of the program and includes small group instruction for low-achieving students.					0
7. The applicant has integrated health, nutrition, and physical activity programming into the academic, enrichment and recreational program design.					
8. The applicant offers students a broad array of additional services, programs and activities, such as: youth development activities, drug, violence and pregnancy prevention programs; art, music and recreation; technical education; and character education programs that are designed to reinforce and complement the regular academic program of participating students.					
9. The applicant offers parents a broad range of activities that parallel the services, programs and activities offered to participating students. (For example: Adult development activities, parent and child shared activities, governance and leadership activities and activities that link parents to schools.)					
10. The applicant documents logical and realistic project activities and timelines to accomplish project goals and objectives.					
11. The applicant describes how children will travel safely to and from the center and home.					
SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL POINTS (out of 90 points)	0				

STRENGTHS

The applicant provided that the students will engage in one hour of recreational activities, arts & crafts, or other physical activities Monday-Thursday (p10). The applicant will provide the children with a snack twice a day. The applicant has provided thorough information on services offered to parents. The applicant provided substantial information regarding substance abuse prevention. The applicant's purpose seems to be focused towards substance abuse prevention and parent training/development. The applicant provided a clear and concise timeline of activities of the proposed program. The applicant stated that transportation will be provided to willing program participants and parents (p 6-11)

WEAKNESSES

Literacy: The applicant provided very little information a literacy component. The applicant does not provide small group instruction nor does their literacy component consist of a framework for language arts or research-based literacy practices (p6). Math: The applicant did not provide any information on a math or science component. Health, Nutrition, and Physical Activity: The applicant does not describe in detail the types of physical activities that will be provided. The applicant did not provide any information on health or nutrition besides stating they will offer a snack to students. Transportation: The applicant does not provide a certain way of transportation (i.e. methods of transportation may include a hired taxi driver, if funds permit a designated vehicle. What is the certain way if funds don't permit a vehicle?) p 11-12

CRITERIA 4: ADEQUACY OF RESOURCES (20 POINTS MAX)

Each application must demonstrate that they have identified adequate support, including facilities, equipment, supplies and other resources.

SCORING CRITERIA	EXCELLENT 5 Points (well conceived, thoroughly developed)	GOOD 4 Points (clear and complete)	MARGINAL 3 Points (requires additional clarification)	WEAK 2 Points (lacks sufficient information)	INADEQUATE 0 Points (information not provided)
1. The applicant provides a description of the adequacy of support, including facilities, equipment, supplies and other resources from the applicant organization and/or partners.					
2. The applicant demonstrates that costs are reasonable in relationship to the number of persons to be served and to the anticipated results and benefits.					
3. The applicant committed a portion of their annual budget to support parent involvement activities and provided a description of how it will be allocated.					0
4. The applicant describes and budgets annually for training and travel of staff for required conferences and in the area of safety.					0
SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL POINTS (out of 20 points)	0				

STRENGTHS

The applicant states several locations of where parent trainings, seminars, or workshops may be housed. The applicant stated that a local partner will provide a significant amount of snacks for the participants. The applicant stated the anticipated number of participants (approx 120 students and 40 parents). p15

WEAKNESSES

The applicant does not detail exactly where students will be housed. The applicant does not detail how many snacks will the local partner will be responsible for or how other costs are reasonable in relationship to the number of persons (it is implied), anticipated results, or benefits. The applicant does not address the portion of the annual budget to support parent involvement, how the parent involvement budget will be allocated, or description/budget for training and travel for staff in this section. p15

CRITERIA 5: QUALITY OF MANAGEMENT PLAN (15 POINTS MAX)

SCORING CRITERIA	EXCELLENT 5 Points (well conceived, thoroughly developed)	GOOD 4 Points (clear and complete)	MARGINAL 3 Points (requires additional clarification)	WEAK 2 Points (lacks sufficient information)	INADEQUATE 0 Points (information not provided)
1. The applicant describes how the organization will disseminate information about the center (including location) to the community in a manner that is understandable and accessible.					
2. The applicant provides a description of the adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time, within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities and milestones to accomplish project tasks.					
3. The applicant provides a description of the operation of the proposed project. The description includes: parents, teachers, business community members, representatives from other professional fields and recipients or beneficiaries of services.					
SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL POINTS (out of 15 points)	0				

STRENGTHS

The applicant provided responsibilities of prag staff (not in thorough detail) and milestones to accomplish project tasks within the designated section. (p15-16)

WEAKNESSES

The applicant did not provide any information on dissemination of information. The applicant asked reviewer to refer to a different section of the proposal for information regarding program administration and supporting staff contributions (p 15). The applicant description did not include parents, teachers, business community members or representatives.

CRITERIA 6: QUALITY OF PROGRAM EVALUATION (20 POINTS MAX)

In accordance with P.L. 107-110 Sec. 4205(b)(2)(A-B), applications will be evaluated based on the extent to which the administration, methodology, and use of periodic (at minimum annual) evaluations will be used to refine, improve, and strengthen programs, including activities, and to refine measurable goals for the program.

SCORING CRITERIA	EXCELLENT 5 Points (well conceived, thoroughly developed)	GOOD 4 Points (clear and complete)	MARGINAL 3 Points (requires additional clarification)	WEAK 2 Points (lacks sufficient information)	INADEQUATE 0 Points (information not provided)
1. The applicant adequately described how evaluation information will be used to monitor progress and to provide accountability information to stakeholders about the success at the project site(s). The applicant provided a timeline of evaluation data collection and reporting activities, including what audiences will receive reports.					
2. The applicant indicates that an internal and/or external evaluator will be used to identify areas to conduct a formative (ongoing) and summative (annual) evaluation.					
3. The applicant indicated how proposed performance measures relate to the intended outcomes of the project, will be used to collect reliable and valid quantitative and qualitative data, and will realistically verify student accomplishment. The applicant identified clear benchmarks (assessed annually or more often) to monitor progress toward specific objectives.					
4. The applicant describes what types of data will be collected, including mandatory student reading and math achievement data, noting what data from project records, such as activity logs and attendance rosters, will be utilized in the evaluation and how such data relate to specific project objectives. The applicant adequately described how the data will be analyzed.					
SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL POINTS (out of 20 points)	0				

STRENGTHS

The applicant stated that the evaluation report will assess how well the program goals and objectives are being met, evaluate the success of the activities and identify areas of improvement. (p17) The applicant stated that student assessments, report cards, attendance sheets and surveys will be collected at the end of the year and after workshops. (p17) Quarterly reports will be conducted throughout the year (does not detail what will be captured. I think they may mean evaluations, instead of reports). p 17

WEAKNESSES

The applicant asked the reviewer to refer to a different section regarding additional evaluation methods and desired outcomes. The applicant did not detail what audiences will receive the reports or if accountability information will be provided to stakeholders. (p 17) The applicant does not detail whether an internal or external evaluator will be used in this section. The applicant did not describe in detail quantitative or qualitative data that will be used.

CRITERIA 7: SUSTAINABILITY (10 POINTS MAX)

In accordance with P.L. 107-110 Sec. 4204(b)(2)(K), each application will be evaluated based on the extent to which it offers strong evidence or presents compelling preliminary evidence of the applicant's ability to sustain services over time.

SCORING CRITERIA	EXCELLENT 10 Points (well conceived, thoroughly developed)	GOOD 8 Points (clear and complete)	MARGINAL 5 Points (requires additional clarification)	WEAK 2 Points (lacks sufficient information)	INADEQUATE 0 Points (information not provided)
1. The applicant provides a convincing, reasonable preliminary plan for sustaining the community learning center(s) after Federal funding ends.					
SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL POINTS (out of 10 points)	0				

STRENGTHS

The applicant has stated that they will try to seek funding for six other areas and what action they plan to take. (p 18)

WEAKNESSES

The action for sustainability will happen after funds have been exhausted; not prior to.

CRITERIA 8: PRIORITY POINTS (20 POINTS MAX)

Applicants who intend to gain priority points should clearly specify this interest in the Project Design portion of the application along with explaining how to fulfill this commitment and the desired outcomes.

SCORING CRITERIA	EXCELLENT 5 Points (well conceived, thoroughly developed)	GOOD 0 Points (clear and complete)	MARGINAL 0 Points (requires additional clarification)	WEAK 0 Points (lacks sufficient information)	INADEQUATE 0 Points (information not provided)
1. The application was submitted jointly with a public school as the lead applicant, and at least one public or private community organization as its partner.					
2. The applicant implemented a STEM Based Program (Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics) and provided a clear and precise explanation of the implementation.					
3. The applicant is running a program that caters to the students in the vicinity of Frederiksted, St. Croix.					
4. The applicant is implementing a summer program in addition to regular services.					0
SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL POINTS (out of 20 points)	0				

STRENGTHS

The applicant has a partner and has included a letter of support from the partner. The applicant target is within the Frederiksted area (p. 5).

WEAKNESSES

The applicant has not included any information that addresses STEM. The applicant did not indicate whether or not if it would implement a summer program.

APPLICANT SCORE SUMMARY

Scores are auto-populated from each criteria and are tabulated on the score summary sheet.

SCORING CRITERIA	Possible Score	Application Score
Criteria 1: Project Abstract	0	0
Criteria 2: Needs Assessment	15	0
Criteria 3: Quality of Project Design	90	0
Criteria 4: Adequacy of Resources	20	0
Criteria 5: Quality of Management Plan	15	0
Criteria 6: Quality of Program Evaluation	20	0
Criteria 7: Sustainability	10	0
Criteria 8: Priority Points	20	0
TOTAL SCORE	190	0

OVERALL STRENGTHS

The applicant's target area is within the Frederiksted area. The applicant provided clear and concise information on Substance Abuse and Parent Trainin

OVERALL WEAKNESSES

The applicant did not provide a great detail on academic achievement services for students (i.e. literacy, math or science). The applicant provided more

 Name of Reviewer

 Signature

 Date
