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# GENERAL

**Extending the due date: 21st CCLC Grant Application Now Due Wednesday, May 12, 2021 by 11:59 PM**

**General Update on Funding and Maximum Number of Sites to be Funded:** CDE will award approximately $5.75 million in 21st CCLC funding under Title IV, Part B of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) of 2015. Additional funding may be available for this opportunity through the ARP-ESSER III (Elementary and Secondary School Emergency Relief Fund and the American Recovery Plan) or other state/federal funding.

If funding is available in addition to the annual 21st CCLC grant allocation for this competition, the additional funding will allow CDE to grant awards to applicants beyond the geographical distribution caps in the chart found on page four of the 2021 21st CCLC RFA. This additional federal/state funding will be awarded based on the highest scores of applicants after the 21st CCLC funding has been awarded and depleted. Applicants must score at least 210 points out of the 280 possible points in the narrative and bonus point sections to be approved for funding. \*

For example, if a district has 25,000 or more students, it is currently allowed to have 14 total funded sites (seven sites with the district as the fiscal agent and seven sites with CBOs/non-district entities as the fiscal agent) through 21st CCLC federal funding. If additional funds are available, and the applicant has included more sites than what can be funded through 21st CCLC funding, the additional funding can go to sites the applicant applied for beyond the distribution chart caps. Application approval is dependent upon application scoring and how much additional funding is available. Please keep in mind that applicants can still include only six sites per submitted application but may submit additional applications to include more sites as they deem necessary.

See the updated chart below illustrating this example.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of Students****in District** | **Maximum Number of Funded 21st CCLC Centers****to each District** | **Maximum Number of Funded 21st CCLC Centers****to Non-District Entities\*** | **Total Maximum Number of 21st CCLC Funded Centers** | **Total Number of Centers funded with non-21st CCLC funding****(if available)** |
| 0 - 1,000 | 4 funded centers | 4 funded centers | 8 funded centers | Unlimited based on scoring and funding available |
| 1,001 - 5,000 | 5 funded centers | 5 funded centers | 10 funded centers | Unlimited based on scoring and funding available |
| 5,001 - 25,000 | 6 funded centers | 6 funded centers |  12 funded centers | Unlimited based on scoring and funding available |
| 25,001 or more | 7 funded centers | 7 funded centers | 14 funded centers | Unlimited based on scoring and funding available |

 ***\**** *For any additional funding outside of the federal allocation specific to ESSA Title IV, B (21st CCLC), the method of allocation and award may change depending upon federal guidelines and recommendations.*

**Q. You mentioned that Office Hours for the grant were held every Friday, but I didn’t catch a time or exactly how I can sign up for them. I would love to talk and get some answers on behalf of the rest of my team, so please let me know when I would need to be there and how I can access the link?**

A. All information on office hours, including access information, dates and times can be found at [www.cde.state.co.us/21stcclc](http://www.cde.state.co.us/21stcclc). The updated RFA FAQ can be found there as well.

Q. Our school is not on the list. Where can we find the four-digit school code/number?

A. All school codes can be found here: <http://www.cde.state.co.us/schoolview>. Look for the section “Find School and District Information” and click on the document “All Colorado School Districts.”

Q. What is the four-digit code CBOs and other non-LEA entities should use on the RFA cover page?

A. CBO and non-LEA entities should put “TBD” in that area and a number will be assigned if the applicant is awarded a grant.

**Q. I am working with a small school district and there is a questions regarding the 12 hours per week. They are creating a weekly schedule to meet this parameter, however due to the size of their school and community, some days the program will have to be cancelled for middle or high school basketball or volleyball games as the same families/teachers will be running those events instead of the 21st Center. They will average 12 hours a week by adding in some Saturday programming. Is it acceptable to average 12 hours per week over the course of the school year?**

A. Cohort IX subgrantees are required to have at least 12 hours of OST programming each week. These hours can be thought of as the hours that the 21st CCLC is “open” in any given week, and is inclusive of any parent and family or weekend programming offered. If you cannot meet the 12 hours for a particular week, averaging is allowed. However, the 12 hours minimum should be the “regular schedule.” Please note that two programs running during the same time block are only counted once towards the required hours.

Q. Does this grant accept applications on an annual basis?

A. CDE’s 21st CCLC Office usually releases Request for Applications (RFAs) for new rounds of funding every other year. The timing for the RFA release is based on the amount of funding available at the state level.

Q. Based on the letter of intent, do you have a sense of how competitive this round will be?

A. It is always competitive, yet we may be receiving some additional ESSER funds in addition to our regular allocation for this RFA, so more funding should be available this year. That means, if the additional funding is confirmed, we will be providing more grants than projected. We cannot project or predict how the competitive grant process will play out. However, it is a good year to apply due to the potential increase of additional funding.

Q. Is the *Intent to Apply* a mandatory requirement to apply for a grant?

A. If interested in applying for this funding opportunity, please complete the Intent to Apply form by Wednesday, March 10, 2021, by 11:59 pm (this has been extended a week from the original date of March 3, 2021). Though strongly encouraged, the Intent to Apply is informational and is not a required component of the grant application submission process. Those who complete the intent to apply will receive updates on the grant.

**Q. We are in the process of creating an arts-based after-school program that will have elementary-age participants but will be run and implemented by middle and high schoolers with adult supervision. I am looking through the grant application, and I want to make sure that it is worth our while to apply? I feel that we hit a majority of the requirements, but we are a one-center operation. Being a rural town, we need activities for our students both after school and through the summer.**

A. This is an applicant-level decision. We recommend reviewing the information, criteria and subsequent scoring provided in the application to determine if you should apply.

Q. In developing the RFA were there considerations other than student population for the equitable distribution tables on page 4? What other considerations were taken into account?

A. One of the overarching priorities in developing this RFA was to align Colorado’s 21st CCLC grant program with the new requirements under the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). To ensure equitable distribution of grants to meet the needs of students statewide and fulfill requirements under ESSA, CDE staff researched what other states are doing to ensure equitable access under ESSA. The model outlined in the Colorado RFA is based on models discussed at national meetings hosted by the U.S. Department of Education and used in other states to ensure compliance and equity.

Q. Do the graph limits include current grants under 21st CCLC in Cohort VIII?

A. No. Current grants funded under the 21st CCLC Cohort VIII do not count toward the equitable distribution table totals on page three of the RFA.

**Q. If we do not apply for this RFA, when do you expect the next one to be released?**

**Similar question: Thinking about 21st CCLC’s Cohort X, when does this process begin (allocation of funds, priority setting, etc.)? Do you anticipate any changes from the Cohort IX process?**

A. Looking at past timelines for our RFAs, the next one will most likely happen in Spring of 2023. The RFA development process starts about six months prior. The decision on when to release a new RFA is based on federal funding available. If you are not already signed up for [The Scoop](https://us5.campaign-archive.com/home/?u=bee6c43ae6102530cf98cadf9&id=ab7e1e5d57), we would recommend you sign up as this provides weekly updates on current grant competitions. It is too early to anticipate changes outside of updating data sets that are referenced in the RFA.

**Q. With the extended deadline for applications moved from April 14 to May 12, will the notification deadline of June 1, also change? Or will we still be notified by June 1 of the status of our application?**

**Similar question: With the deadline extension, does the timeline stay the same (and is this correct)?**

* **Notification of status of our application on June 1**
* **First reimbursement request is made in September**

**Similar question: What is the fiscal year for each grant year, is it September 2021 to August 2022, and so on?**

A. We are expediting the review process, but reviewers need time for grant review. Applicants will most likely get notifications mid to late June. Programs run by state fiscal year 7/1 -6/30. If approved applicants need additional time starting off their program, we will work with them on a timeline that is appropriate to their needs. However, the grant period will begin 7/1/21.

**Q. With the notification date being June 1 (or later), and the grant starting on July 1, is there an expectation to have a full summer program in summer of 2021? Or would the first summer program be expected to occur in 2022? It may be challenging to hire summer stuff in June, when most teachers and school staff have already planned their summer.**

A. We know this summer and back-to-school time are important this year considering COVID- 19 learning loss. Approved applicants can have summer programming and back-to-school programming (back to school academies). However, the requirements of the grant for summer schools is for Summer 2022.

Q. We want to apply for two sites with separate codes within the same building and want to be sure we can request up to $150,000 for each site.

A. If each school to be served has a unique school code, they can be considered individual sites and would be eligible for up to $150,000 in funding at each site.

**Q. How do CDE's priorities and goals play a role in determining and shaping RFAs? As we look through Colorado's ESSA plan (**[**Link**](https://urldefense.com/v3/__https%3A/www.cde.state.co.us/fedprograms/co-consolidatedstateplan-final-websitepdf__;!!M87Ej6RJKlw!EFuNEgO8k1GjztUhLU-6FU1oWRRVQnuaO5Y7-AxFqAzop_aH_SHsgcYwObojjhJ-Zxt7a07C$)**), this isn’t clearly connected in Section E. Is there somewhere else we can find this information?**

A. The information provided by Colorado’s 21st CCLC program to the U.S. Department of Education for the link above directly answered the questions in the U.S. Department of Education’s ESSA State Plan Template that states were required to complete and submit post-ESEA reauthorization. Colorado’s ESSA State Plan, including the components referenced your question above, was vetted and approved by the U.S. Department of Education.

The full process for development and submission of the ESSA State Plan can be found [here](https://www.cde.state.co.us/fedprograms/essa#:~:text=Colorado's%20ESSA%20State%20Plan&text=The%20title%20of%20the%20reauthorized,Student%20Succeeds%20Act%20(ESSA).&text=This%20law%20also%20requires%20states,special%20help%20for%20struggling%20schools). It includes Hub committees; the public comment opportunities and process; the stakeholder feedback process including subgroups, statewide community and education meetings; and also included the process for review and approval by the Colorado State Board of Education. The 21st CCLC program was included in this full process.

The 21st CCLC program is crosscutting with many strategic areas at CDE including the goals listed below:

* By the end of third grade, all students can read at grade level.
* Regardless of demographics and learning needs, all students meet or exceed state academic standards.
* All students and families have access to quality schools that meet their students' needs.
* Students graduate high school with knowledge, skills and experience needed for college and career success.
* High quality educators are in every classroom; strong leaders are in every building.

It also fits under several key initiatives, including *All Means All: Expand Access and Opportunity for Historically Underserved Students.*

In Colorado, we are failing to ensure that students from historically underserved backgrounds—specifically those from economically challenged communities, highly mobile families, racial minority groups, English learners and students with disabilities—report academic outcomes that are truly reflective of their talents, so they have a wide variety of options to thrive in our communities and succeed in today’s economy. By concentrating on equity as a foundational construct of our work at CDE, we will empower schools and districts in their efforts to increase access and opportunity and ultimately reduce the pervasive influence that systemic inequities have on student outcomes. CDE’s strategic plan can be found [here](https://www.cde.state.co.us/cdecomm/strategicplan).

**Q. How does that State Board, Advisory Council, and Open Comment period play a role in finalizing the RFA? Are there other groups, considerations, etc. that influence the RFA? If so, what/who are they?**

A. By law, the state must award funds to eligible entities in consultation with the Governor and other State agencies responsible for administering youth development programs and adult learning activities in Colorado. This included but was not limited to the Governor’s Office, CAP and TGYS, as well as the state Youth Advisory Council.

Additionally, a comprehensive RFA debrief was held with the 21st CCLC state advisory committee after the 2018 RFA process. Each RFA section was pulled out and discussed, with feedback obtained from the field to be considered for the 2020 RFA. This 2021 RFA is the 2020 RFA that was released and delayed due to the COVID-19 pandemic. With unexpected school closures and escalating student needs from COVID, significant barriers were created for the afterschool field to develop, plan and submit applications for future programming. The state office received dozens of requests from the field to postpone the 2020 RFA during the early phases of COVID and responded to those requests by delaying that RFA until Spring of 2021. We also reviewed the FAQ from the last RFA and provided updates based on feedback during the application and peer review process.

We are always open for feedback on the program. I received an email from an afterschool provider asking about public comment on this RFA. We offered for them to submit feedback. No response was received.

**Q. Specific to the Advisory Council, can you share information about who is on it, what their role is, how people are chosen to serve on it, etc.?**

A. The purpose of the 21st CCLC Advisory Board is to provide CDE’s Office of Community Partnerships with valuable grantee perspective on the state administration of the 21st CCLC grant, to be used in the state’s continuous improvement of the policies and procedures of the grant program.

The Board are selected by the state 21st CCLC office based on an application process. Board members commit to 2-year terms on the board. Board members will be selected as to appropriately represent all 21st CCLC grantees, ensuring representation from rural, urban, non-profits, alternative education campuses, and all grade levels of programming.

21st CCLC seeks members for the state 21st CCLC Advisory Board on an annual basis. Current and past 21st CCLC grantees with experience and commitment in working on behalf of students and families participating in 21st CCLC out of school time programs and improving their educational outcomes are encouraged to apply. Announcements for the open application process are made at subgrantee meetings, webinars and other meetings with the field. Additionally, Advisory Committee Members present updates at subgrantee meetings and connect with others in the field as needed for feedback they can present during meetings.

A current list of members follows:

* Becky Medina BGC Pueblo
* Bryan Bohanan DPS DELCS
* Lisa Fields Jeffco Alameda
* Stephanie Hansen Adams 12
* Adrienne Atencio High Valley Community Center
* Scott Wilbur BGC Metro Denver
* Jozette Martinez Mapleton York
* Ashley Prow BGC Larimer County
* Michael Seefried Gunnison School District (Also, Greeley School District prior to this year)
* Ismael Robles Aurora Public Schools
* Elaine Menardi Colorado AeroLab

**Q. Who ultimately approves the 21st CCLC RFA?**

A. CDE and program leadership, CDE’s Competitive Grants and Awards office, and CDE’s Grants Fiscal Management reviews and approves the RFA. In addition, it undergoes a comprehensive review by the Education Data and Accountability Committee (EDAC). More information on EDAC can be found here: <https://www.cde.state.co.us/cdereval/edacinfo>. Also, the 2020 RFA was reviewed and approved by the U.S. Department of Education during their Colorado comprehensive on-site monitoring visit in January 2020. This RFA closely follows the postponed one from 2020 that was released and delayed due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

**Q. What specific supports does CDE provide to grantees related to sustainability planning?**

A. CDE asks questions regarding sustainability plans and provides TA for sustainability questions in the RFA. Further, CDE provides a multi-day orientation for new cohorts of subgrantees where sustainability expectations and professional development is provided. Our Lead Consultants also conduct onsite orientation visits where they review the grant application to answer questions and provide customized TA, including sustainability planning.

CDE provides sustainability trainings and best practices in sustainability “peer leadership groups” each year during our subgrantee meetings/trainings. The most recent sustainability peer panel and training occurred in February 2021. Additionally, per the 21st CCLC Request for Applications (RFA): “By the end of the second year of funding, subgrantees will be required to complete a written comprehensive sustainability plan which describes strategies for securing partnerships and other sources of funding or in-kind resources to maintain the level of program services beyond the grant period.” The plan is reviewed by the state 21st CCLC office with feedback provided. The template can be found [here](http://www.cde.state.co.us/21stCCLC).

On that template, is information to a link to a [Colorado 21st CCLC “Sustainability Peer Panel” discussion](http://bit.ly/2hPrOZn) highlighted by the national Afterschool Alliance.

Other resources for sustainability include the [Y4Y Discussion Board on Sustainability](https://y4y.ed.gov/forums/viewthread/94) and utilizing the new 21st CCLC funding chart to project other potential program revenue sources for years three, four, and five. Sustainability updates are also required in end-of-year plans and are a part of the exemplar requirements of the grant.

It is important to note that 21st CCLC funding is considered seed funding to incubate programs, it is not meant to be long-term sustainable funding. The 21st CCLC state office is here to facilitate planning and provide technical assistance regarding sustainability. However, sustainability of programming beyond the life of the 21st CCLC grant is the responsibility of 21st CCLC subgrantees. If grantees are unable to fully sustain their programming, the expectation is that is that they work toward sustaining the parts of their program that are most effective.

**Q. We are planning to submit one grant, to request for five sites. Two sites are in DPS and three are in Cherry Creek. Is this acceptable or do we need to submit two separate applications, one per district, even if we are the fiscal agent for both?**

A. You do not need to submit two applications. You can apply for schools in multiple districts, just be sure to following the RFA instructions and information about partner schools/districts (including signatures) and include information about each in your narrative answers. If you would like to submit separate grants, that is an option as well.

**Q. For the 21st CCLC grant, is NWEA an approved method for measuring progress on core academic performance?**

A. NWEA is an approved measure for our academic performance measure.

**Q. For the grant submission do we need an MOU from the district in addition to the center expectations form/s.**

A. It is highly recommended that MOUs are put in place between non-LEA entities and partner districts to ensure all parties are clear on the project’s performance measures, data needed, roles of partners, program and space needs, as well as other assurances and requirements of the grant.

See question H.5: *“Demonstrate the relevant commitment of each partner to the success of implementation of the proposed project.* ***Note:*** *Applicant must include commitment letters from all partners listed in order to receive maximum points. If applying as a consortium, a consortium agreement is required.”*

**Q. We are working on the 21st Century Learning Center grant and I was wondering if you might be able to recommend a vendor, or provide names of vendors who have performed this for other grantees?**

A. As a state agency, we cannot endorse organizations or specific vendors. However, we do have an external organizations survey that nonprofits can fill out. Subgrantees or other afterschool programs can access this information as they are developing their programs. The survey and more information can be found at: <http://www.cde.state.co.us/21stcclc/resources>. We also have a “Local-Level Evaluation Templates and Examples” section on our website with a lot of helpful tools and resources: <http://www.cde.state.co.us/21stcclc/subgranteeresources>.

**Q. Just have a quick question on the 21st CCLC Risk Assessment. Question 14 asks: 14) Number of years that the authorized representative’s primary fiscal contact has been in the position (or a similar position) as of the application date? <1 year 1-2 years 3-5 years 6-9 years More than 10 years**

**Should we answer this to be towards our CFO or myself? CFO is certainly the primary fiscal contact. As the grants accounting manager, I have the day to day oversight of grants and am the fiscal point of contact for things like the request for funds, and single audit. Or maybe it doesn’t matter and could go with either?**

A. The primary fiscal contact is the staff member who will directly overseeing the fiscal management of the 21st CCLC grant. Applicants will designate a qualified individual for this role and provide their length of employment for question 14 on the application.

In term of authorized signatures, that person has the authority to commit the district to the assurances, partnership requirements and other grant mandates, we can accept their signature.

**Q. Is there a date when grantees will know if they are funded?**

A. We are expecting to notify grantees in mid/late June.

**Q. Can you share how the additional ESSER funding possibilities will be determined?**

A. CDE leadership is still determining, with federal guidance and community input, the most effective use of these additional funds. Some of those dollars may come to 21st CCLC but we do not have specific information at this point. If we do receive dollars, we will be able to fund additional sites in this RFA process and the site limits currently listed in the RFA will be removed. We do not anticipate having another grant competition for additional dollars that may be available, but would ideally fund the applicants in Cohort IX that met the scoring requirements but were not funded by the primary 21st CCLC allocation.

**Q. How many sites do you anticipate funding with the base 21st CCLC funding?**

A. CDE anticipates funding approximately 30 sites, but a final number won’t be determined until we see the funding requests from the approved applications.

# DEFINITION AND DESCRIPTION OF TERMS

Q. What is the difference between subgrantees vs. centers/sites/schools?

A. Under the law, the state provides grants to fiscal agents outlined in the “eligible applicants” section of the RFA on page three. Once funded, these entities are called subgrantees. A subgrantee runs an approved program at “center,” usually at school. A center is also referred to as a site.

**Q. Based on the criteria (in this email), are we 1 center, or more? (Assuming each center has to have a minimum of programming hours, we probably could only be 1).**

A. This is an applicant-level decision. We recommend reviewing the definitions, criteria and other information provided in the RFA to determine if you are applying for one center or more.

**Q. We are partnering with a few main organizations to apply for this grant, and we think we are a consortium of entities that will create one learning center, but I need to confirm with you. This grant fits in very well our intent to continue to partner with our community. Our partners are the rec center, the library, a CBO for youth development and prevention, and a counseling center for youth—group and individual. We will use various spaces for learning, including indoor facilities of each partner, the community, and the outdoors. Do we fit the definition of a consortium of entities?**

A. This is an applicant-based decision. The criteria for consortium grants can be found in the “*Glossary of Terms*” (Appendix J) of the RFA and in this FAQ as a response to other questions regarding consortium grants.

**Q. I am applying to renew our Consortium and wondering what exactly was expected for the Consortium agreement? I will have letters of commitment from each of the three site’s principals acknowledging that we are a consortium grant along with each center’s principal signoff form, but curious if there is something different that is expected?**

A. Specific criteria and considerations for consortium grants are found in the “*Glossary of Terms*” (Appendix J) of the RFA and in questions/responses from last week’s office hours (found below).

Q. What is the different between “district” and “non-district entity” when looking at the table on page four of the RFA that addresses equitable geographical distribution?

A. A district is a public school district in Colorado. A non-district entity is another eligibility entity listed on page three of the RFA. That entity must partner with the local district and schools for which the applicant is seeking funding.

# ELIGIBILITY

**Q. I want to make sure our program qualifies to apply—I can see in the 21st CCLA 2021 RFA document that a Traditional application type is for: Program activities held during non-school hours and periods when school is not in session (e.g., before school, after school, weekends, and during summer breaks). Summer programming is required for all funded 21st CCLC centers. However, in the Survey Monkey application it indicates that a “traditional” program is defined as: Traditional 21st CCLC with Summer Program Application (Must be open for a minimum of 12 hours per week for 26 weeks during the regular school year and have 60 hours of summer programming) Our program is not offered for any period of time during the regular school year. Are we still eligible to apply as a Traditional program for the grant?**

A. Both are true. The traditional application type is for program activities held during non-school hours and periods when school is not in session (e.g., before school, after school, weekends, and during summer breaks). Summer programming is required for all funded 21st CCLC centers. In terms of requirements, programs must be open for a minimum of 12 hours per week for 26 weeks during the regular school year and have 60 hours of summer programming. Programs that do not offer out-of-school time programming during the school year would not meet the minimum requirements to receive a grant.

**Q. Is it correct that a "learning center" does not have to be a building?**

**Similar question: We can only apply for sites that we operate out of an actual school location, correct? We offer after-school programs both at schools and at our Y branches.**

A. Applicants can choose where programming is held but they must have a primary location. It is important to follow the requirements found in the RFA including, but not limited, to the following:

* The proposed community learning center may be located in a facility other than an elementary or secondary school. However, the alternate facility must be at least as available and accessible to the participants as if the program were located in an elementary or secondary school.
* Applicants will be asked within the application to describe how the facility in which the program will be housed (in all years of the grant) is safe and accessible in accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, and how students will travel safely to and from the center and home.
* The proposed program was developed, and will be carried out, in active collaboration with the schools that participating students attend (including through the sharing of relevant data among the schools), all participants of the eligible entity, and any partnership entities (which includes partnerships between an LEA, a community-based organization, and other public entity or private entity, if appropriate), in compliance with applicable laws relating to privacy and confidentiality.
* Applicants must collaborate with other public and/or private agencies, including the local school district, to create programs as comprehensive and high quality as possible.
* Safe and appropriate space is essential for successful programming. This may include access to classrooms, libraries, gymnasiums, technology labs, and outdoor fields during out-of-school hours. Programs may also need office space for staff members and storage space for program equipment. While it is not expected that the 21st CCLC program be given priority usage over other programs, host centers are expected to reasonably accommodate the space needs of the program.

Q. Per our letter of intent submitted on 3/3, we are applying for the following schools: Alice Terry Elementary School (Sheridan/Englewood), Park Lane Elementary School (Aurora), Farrell B. Howell Ece-8 (Denver), and Florida Pitt Waller K-8 School Ece-8 (Denver). We reviewed the Q/A similar to this question: “Q. How many sites can my organization apply for under one grant application? A. Applicants may apply for up to six sites per application.” This FAQ addresses multiple schools within the same school district; however, not for our scenario. What would be the best approach here?

A. Applicants can apply for up to six sites per application, regardless if those sites are under one school district or multiple.

Q. Can a school district and nonprofit apply for a consortium grant?

A. A school district and nonprofit can apply as a consortium. However, there are specific criteria and considerations. The language below comes from the “*Glossary of Terms*” (Appendix J) of the RFA.

Consortium: Group of two or more eligible entities, which can include community-based organizations and school districts. A consortium of entities may apply together to provide services for centers. One organization must be designated as the lead fiscal agent of the consortium. In addition, an applicant consortium must designate one individual, a Program Director, who will be responsible for communication and coordination across all centers within the consortium. Please note this does not include applications that meet the minimum requirement for partnering with a school. The collaboration outlined in the application must include detailed information regarding partnership management, programmatic collaboration, and fiscal collaboration and cooperation. Additionally, consortium applications:

* Must demonstrate the strength and quality of the proposed collaboration throughout the entire grant application. The LEA and other organization(s) must work extensively in the planning and design of the program;
* Each must have substantial roles in the delivery of services;
* Each must share grant resources to implement the proposed project effectively;
* Each must be involved in the management and oversight of the proposed program; and
* Must have a signed agreement between both entities stating the collaboration of efforts, resources, and funding must be submitted with the grant application. This document must clearly define and detail the roles and responsibilities of all parties involved with explicit expectations outlined.

Q. Does the fiscal agent need to be a school district? Can other community agencies apply?

A. No, the fiscal agent does not need to be a district. It can be any entity described on page three of the RFA under the “eligible applicants” section. However, whichever entity is applying as the fiscal agent for the grant, it must have an established DUNS # with the federal government and have an active status on SAM.gov.

**Q. I am writing to find out if our higher education university, a 501(c)(3) public entity, is eligible to apply to the 21st CCLC Request for Applications (RFA) for Cohort IX. We are hoping to submit a proposal for our community-based program for high school students in STEM. This program is administered by students enrolled at the university so the proposal would be submitted on behalf of the university. Please let us know if our institution is eligible for this award. If we do not apply for this RFA, when do you expect the next one to be released?**

A. Based on the criteria in our RFA, the university should be eligible to apply. It is important to note, however, that the program is specific to K-12 grades and eligible fiscal agents must partner with at least one Colorado public school for programming that serves those students specific to the partner school. The partner school is the cohort of students that are served. When you stated you are a community-based program serving students in STEM, the program would need exist in partnership with a specific school (or schools if you are writing a grant for more than one center/site). This grant does not fund a program that exists independent of a school partner. Also, if the students are enrolled at the university, are they all enrolled in high school as well? They would need to be enrolled in the partner K-12 school.

Q. If a high school currently has a federally-funded Gear Up program, is there a conflict with 21st CCLC project serving the same students? The Gear Up program takes place during the school day.

A. As long as there is not a redundancy in services or the funding sources are not both being charged for the same work, there should not be a problem. They may make a great partner, bringing some resources to the table, with the afterschool/out-of-school time program bring others.

**Q. For example, I read that we must partner with the schools but did not have clarity on how that would work for a facility school that would be serving as a site? Is it possible for the facility school to serve as a single site? The school is an intervention school that brings students from a range of public schools who are not able to maintain their classroom engagement.**

A. Yes – facility schools can be funded as 21st Century Community Learning Centers, assuming they meet all 21st CCLC program requirements as outlined in the Request for Applications (RFA). For example, all 21st CCLC programming must occur outside the regular school day as defined by the institution (unless you’ve applied as an ELT grant) and participation in the program cannot be compulsory.

**Q. The second scenario is for an existing after school program that already works with DPS and has an existing MOU to provide services in school but also has the after-school programming. How would that agency partner with the school specifically for this proposal? Do they go to each school and seek the partnership? I just wasn’t clear how the agency would establish the partnership and what would be required since there is already a partnership? Are they eligible to apply? Also, if the school district already gets this funding, wouldn’t that preclude the nonprofit from applying?**

A. An agency would be permitted to partner with any school that is not currently funded with a 21st CCLC Cohort VIII grant. If a particular school already has a 21st CCLC Cohort VIII grant, that school would not be eligible to be served by a Cohort IX grant, regardless of which entity is the fiscal agent. At the district level, districts are restricted in the number of grants and sites as described in the RFA – meaning districts can have multiple grants but individual sites cannot. If a pre-existing afterschool program exists at a potential site that is not funded currently by a 21st CCLC Cohort VIII grant, that school would still be eligible for grant funding. However, it would be incumbent on an applicant to describe how it would partner with the existing program to sufficiently expand or enhance services (supplement and not supplant) to justify the requested funds.

**Q. Our program team had a couple more questions — we thought we understood that we have to partner with a district — but being a facility school technically part of the district we do not need an additional school partner correct?**

A. That is correct. The programming must be designed to serve a specific school population, and as a CBO – that school would be your school/district partner.

**Q. As a standalone CCLC reaching maybe 30-40 students, would a single site like this be a competitive applicant?**

A. The application process is competitive and applications are scored by peer reviewers. The state office does not offer guidance on what makes for a competitive applicant. Please refer to the RFA for information on expectations and subsequent scoring.

# PRIORITY CONSIDERATIONS AND POINTS

**Q. We are applying for a center at that is on the priority list. Should I use the “school number” listed on the priority list on the application when referring to the “school code”?**

A. Yes, they are the same number.

**Q. We are writing for a school in our school district. This district is small and comprises 3 different elementary schools (ECE, K-2, 3-8), and are in very close proximity to each other. As we know, if a family has multiple children in a home, a barrier to attendance can be if a sibling can also be in the program. We plan to target families that attend our school for our summer program. This means that some of the students will be from the neighboring 3-5 school. Can you confirm that we will still receive priority points for writing specifically for out school and the siblings, so that we can support the whole family?**

A. Writing for multiple sites is an option for this RFA. However, all school codes must be on the priority list to receive the points.

Centers/sites are expected to prioritize for services the students described in the “target population” section of the grant application. If programs have maximized students from this population at the host site and have space for additional students, they may serve any students from the greater community who meet the target population parameters (e.g. age or grade level). For example, programs that are not at capacity may serve students who are home schooled or attend private schools if they live in the school community, assuming priority for program spots is given to students that grant was approved to serve. Likewise, centers/sites must prioritize the parents and families of student participants for family services. If the program is considered family engagement for the student population, you can offer programming to siblings but this is not an option with primary 21st CCLC student programming.

Q. My district’s school is not listed as a priority school in Appendix A but I do understand we would be eligible for some of the other priority points (including rural). Can you please let me know in past grant rounds if schools have been awarded when not listed on the priority list? Does this happen frequently?

A. You are correct about priority points. Your district can apply even if the schools are not on the Appendix A priority list. In the last grant round, schools received grants that were not on the priority list because their application scored high in other areas.

Q. Can one application request funding for multiple priority schools and how are those priority points assigned?

A.One application may serve more than one priority school in a district. Remember, information on all the schools for which the applicant is applying must be included in the application. Of note, all schools in the application must be on the priority list in Appendix A to receive the priority points assigned to priority schools.

**Q. This RFA includes four additional priority areas for funding. Priority points are available in the scoring rubric to support priority areas. Applicants may be eligible to receive priority points for one or more of the priority areas. The following are the priority areas for this grant competition:**

**1.    Serving a school with priority eligibility, as determined by the priority list in Appendix A.**

**2.    Rural school districts, as defined by CDE\*.**

Would we still be eligible for the full 40 points with a mixture of districts served?

A. Just as all schools included in one application must be on the priority list (*Appendix A*) in order to receive the school priority points, all districts included in one application must be designated as “rural” in order to receive the rural designation priority points. Please see [CDE’s Rural Designation List](https://www.cde.state.co.us/cdeedserv/cderuraldesignationmarch2021) for more information on the “rural” and “small rural” school district designations as well as the complete list of districts that fit within these designations, as of March 2021.

Q. We are only applying to serve the elementary grade levels at a charter school that is K-12, under the one school code which is on the priority list. Are we eligible for Priority funding even though we are serving only a sub population within the school?

A. Yes, however you will want to show in the demonstration of need and throughout the application on why you are providing programming to a subpopulation within the school. We have had other grantee, for example, target specific grades within the school that showed the most need.

**Q. Regarding the RFA, what is the process for determining priorities and bonus points? (E.g., Cohort IX has FRL, rural, HS, and non-prior award as the bonus point areas)**

A. 21st CCLC law mandates priority for schools that are considered high-poverty, and low performing. Colorado’s definition of these terms can be found on page five of the RFA. The law also requires geographical diversity, and quality applications based on the legal section called “Measures of Effectiveness.” You will also notice in the reauthorized law an emphasis on partnering with local workforce development programs and agencies. Colorado’s 21st CCLC did not have many programs representing this emphasis; hence, the priority in that area. All priorities are based on quantitative data that can be assessed/measured in a non-subjective manner.

These priorities were vetted with the community during the RFA post-reauthorization ESSA State Plan process, and with other statewide entities running youth development programs, as well as the Governor’s Office (See information above on the post-reauthorization ESSA state plan feedback process). A great deal of direct afterschool provider feedback came through the ESEA in-person Colorado statewide 21st CCLC Listening Session lead and facilitated by Jen Reinhardt (Sr. Vice President of Research and Policy at the national Afterschool Alliance). This listening session was posted widely and was in co-partnership with CAP. Participants consisted of 21st CCLC program and non-21st CCLC OST programs statewide. Feedback was obtained from participants during this session and on CDE’s website.

Of note: Colorado received positive commendations from the U.S. Department of Education for its recent statewide priorities and emphasis during their comprehensive on-site monitoring visit held in January 2020. Past 21st CCLC cohorts were not considered geographically diverse, and Colorado was at risk of a federal noncompliance finding in this area. That risk was mitigated through the equitable geographical distribution chart. You will also note that the equitable geographic distribution chart maximum caps were broadened since the 2018 and 2020 RFA to allow larger districts to be approved for more sites (if the competitive review process results show they scored high enough to receive funding). We made this decision to ensure a geographically balanced portfolio of grants.

**Q. Is there anything specific that we should refer to in the application to prove that we are an applicant who met high-quality past performance in Cohort VII in order to qualify for the 10 bonus points? Or is that information that the reviewers will already have?**

A. The reviewers will have that information based on state office records and information. However, if you want to mention that in your narrative as well, you are welcome to do so.

# FUNDING AND AWARD PARAMETERS

**Q. I have heard that there may be more funding for this grant. Does that mean that the range of $50,000 - $150,000 per center has changed?**

A. The range of $50,000-$150,000 remains the same. Additional funding may be available through the Elementary and Secondary School Emergency Relief (ESSER) Funds, including the American Rescue Plan (ARP) Act. Final decisions have not been made on this funding. If additional funding is received, the 21st CCLC program will be able to increase the number of grants made to Colorado communities.

**Q. Our program has been ongoing with the bulk of the funding recently being provided by the school district- which includes 3 full-time employees along with multiple tutors and part-time staff. This represents a large percentage of the expenses for the program. We are concerned with supplanting issue. Would we be able to request funds for the ongoing staff expenses for our existing program?**

A. Supplanting simply stated is – the Federal funds are adding value and not replacing what is already occurring. You mentioned the district has provided support and supplanting would be an issue for costs already covered by the district. If the district determined they could no longer support the program and the application was intended to meet these needs, and it was explained within the application, then supplanting would most likely not be an issue. The key point to address is that the district has notified your agency that they could no longer provide the support due to budget concerns.

**Q. In regards to staff time and budgets should we be including salary details for only program days during school year and summer, or can we factor in non-program days and PTO for staff? Does that make sense? I guess the question is can we include PTO days for staff in our 21st budget?**

A. Typically, labor costs are charged to a grant, it encompasses whatever leave time is included in that position. If the employee is paid through various funding sources, the PTO hours should be shared proportionally across funding codes.

Q. If an applicant is writing a consortium grant can all the sites listed in the grant received up to $150,000 each?

A. A consortium of entities may apply together to provide services for centers. One organization must be designated as the lead fiscal agent of the consortium. The collaboration outlined in the application must include detailed information regarding partnership management, programmatic collaboration, and fiscal collaboration and cooperation. If a consortium grant is applying for multiple centers, each center/site must meet the requirements outlined in the RFA for partnering with schools. Each proposed center can apply for $50,000 to $150,000. As is the case with other applications, the funding amount requested should be reasonable and appropriate, and based on demonstration of need and other criteria outlined in the RFA. Please be sure to see the *“Glossary of Terms”* (Appendix J) of the RFA for additional information that should be include in consortium applications.

Q. Our organization runs an education collaborative and as such I’ve had many of the schools we work with reach out for our support around this grant. We want to clear on the approved role of non-profits within this grant and advise them correctly. The RFA says: “Partnering with one or more outside organizations, such as a nonprofit organization with demonstrated experience in improving student achievement”. If the school/district is requesting support from our organization around coaching and services for planning, community relationships, data collection, SEL curriculum/program, and College and Career Readiness/work based learning projects, these would be acceptable budgeted items?

A. In terms of the question regarding planning, the costs associated with any of the work done prior to the award would not be allowed as the grant does not allow pre-award costs. For the other question, if the LEA is the applicant applying as the fiscal agent for the grant, your organization would be considered a partner. If your organization is the applicant applying as the fiscal agent for the grant, the LEA would be the partner. Whichever way you choose to apply, it is important to clearly outline the established role(s), timelines, and deliverables of the applicant and the partner. Allowable activities under the grant can be found on page eight of the RFA. These costs must align with the demonstration of need and subsequent program design and implementation outlined in the proposal.

**Q. Is the cost per student based on the full grant (all sites/centers) or do you want a cost per student per site/center?**

A. The way the RFA is set up, cost per student is at the grantee level. It is not center/site specific. If there is a large difference in cost per student by center/site, please provide additional information in the narrative rubric section H.2 and other appropriate areas throughout application.

# APPLICATION COMPONENTS

**Q. How many sites can my organization apply for under one grant application?**

A. Applicants may apply for up to six sites per application.

**Q. I had a question in reference to the performance measure/SMART goal section of the 21st CCLC grant application. As we write out our SMART goals answering each of the 5 questions we need to establish a baseline measure. For example in past applications that I have submitted our baseline data was established at the end of year one, such as “x” amount of 21st CCLC participants will demonstrate growth in math/science.**

**I am trying to figure out the best way to establish and phrase baseline measures for the 2021 application. Perhaps I am overthinking it, but would it be sufficient to say for example; The proposed number of students projected to be served at each site “x” percent will demonstrate growth in CMAS math/science in year 1 and incrementally increase in year 2 and 3? Or are they looking at the most recent available data in core academics in math and science from each site’s UIP or CDE aggregated school data? Or are our baseline measures the figures we projected for students/family members served?**

A . Apply the “X to Y by Z” format. In this format, “X” is the baseline, “Y” is the desired outcome, and “Z” is the time allotted to complete the goal. This format can be followed in a simple sentence that aligns with the SMART goal framework that is required for the 21st CCLC grant.

Baseline data is essential to help you assess and develop realistic outcomes and to ensure that you are able to capture your efforts in year one. An example of baseline data that is often included in performance measures are pre-surveys given to students when they first start attending 21st CCLC programming at the beginning of the school year. A helpful guide is available for writing 21st CCLC performance measures. It can be found at [www.cde.state.co.us/21stcclc](http://www.cde.state.co.us/21stcclc). Look for the section “Supplemental Application Materials” with the document name of “21st CCLC Performance Measure Development Guide.” If baseline data is not available, you can indicate in this your application. However, we recommend providing baseline data, when available.

**Q. I am applying for two sites this year (intermediate and high school). Should I write one SMART goal for each site within the categories? Or, should I have one SMART goal in each category that encompasses both sites?**

A. This is an applicant-level decision. Many applicants have one SMART goal in each category that encompasses all sites/centers, but that may not be possible with separate schools. Applicants will want to assess to see which option works best for them.

**Q. I am working with two schools on an application, and there is a question about the first Performance Measure. Appendix D states this as "Core Academics: To help students...etc... will provide academic activities in mathematics and science". Is it intended that this measure be limited to math and science, or can Centers add measures in other content areas? We are applying for elementary schools, where literacy is very important, and a better predictor of long term academic success.**

A. Literacy is important and can be a part of the program design and activities of the grant based on student needs. You will find many references to literacy programs, tutoring, etc. under allowable and recommended usages for funding on pages 8-9 the RFA. For the specific Performance Measure that you are referencing, we are focusing on math and science.

Q. It looks like the considerations for Core Academics have changed since the last application cycle in 2018 from "reading and math" to "science and math." This seems significant and we wanted to check and see if this needed to be addressed specifically in the grant (i.e., what specific actions are taken during programming to cover these subjects) or if we could continue with the basis of or organization being that its tutoring is individualized per student and all areas are covered. Our organization also provides extracurricular programming in STEAM areas. Would this be an important consideration in the core academics section, or should that section be dedicated to academic tutoring?

A. Tutoring, reading, math and STEM/STEAM are all allowable activities under the 21st CCLC programming. The types of programming and services offered through 21st CCLC program should be based on student and family needs, as articulated by the applicant in Section A of the narrative section. Specific to the state performance measure on academic outcomes, the focus on math and STEM is based on research showing the high level of impact these types of programs have on student outcomes. Applicants can provide any number of programs and services their application. The math and STEM focus is specific to Performance Measure #1. Lists of allowable activities can be found on pages 8-9 of the RFA.

Q. The text of the RFP reads that transportation is not mandatory, but is a "recommended activity;" however, we remembered transportation as being mandatory for Cohort VIII. Just some clarification on this would be great!

A. “Describing how the facility in which the program will be housed (in all years of the grant) is safe and accessible in accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, and how students will travel safely to and from the center and home” are a part of the requirements of the grant and questions/statements on transportation can be found in the narrative section and assurances in the RFA. However, different programs have different models and not all applicants include transportation costs in their application because that is provided by another partner.

**Q. How long should the average Comprehensive ELT Plan be? (just looking for a ‘ballpark’ range)**

A. This is an applicant-level decision there is no expected minimum or maximum range.

**Q. Confirming the additional 300 hours for ELT programming is based on CDE’s minimum requirement of 990 hours per year for elementary schools, correct?**

A. Work specifically with your partner school to list how many hours they offer prior to the ELT model and how many will be offered after the proposed ELT model.

Q. We are looking into the 21st Century grant funding opportunity. I was looking through the PowerPoint slides about the grant, and see a lot of references to various Appendices, but I’m unsure of where to locate them to get more information. Can you please assist?

A. All appendices can be found at the back of the RFA hardcopy document.

**Q. Appendix F: Risk Assessment, on question number 9, please provide some guidance on the scope/number of grants to be provided. Some LEA's receive many grants per year and this could be a lengthy response. Question on form: “Has the authorized representative received federal or state awards from the Colorado Department of Education in the past four years (since FY16-17)? If Yes, which program and year?”**

A. Applicants can group grants in broad categories for that question. For example: ESEA FY16-17, FY17-18, FY 18-19, FY19-20, FY20-21; IDEA (include appropriate fiscal years); CARES Act (include appropriate FY years), etc.

Q. If a lead applicant is planning to submit two separate applications to serve different sites, do you have guidance on much of the applications’ narrative sections need to be differentiated if some information will be similar or the same for the two applications (for example, organizational/leadership capacity)?

A. The submission of duplicate applications that are identical, except for names and descriptions of the eligible center, will not be accepted. Applications from applicants in the same district or working with the same collaborators may contain some common information, but the substantive elements of the application narrative must be unique to the eligible center(s).

**Q. We are confused regarding exactly what is being asked in Section F questions 2 and 3. Question 2 askes for the evaluation process and 3 asks for the evaluation plan, can you explain the difference between process and plan? Question 2 should we use the categories in Appendix E to answer a/ and b) for each of those data collection types? Question 3, would a chart with short- and long-term outcomes listed and be described for each outcome be sufficient?**

A. The difference in a process versus an evaluation plan is the level of detail. Many subgrantees may not have hired or identified an evaluator/data analyst for their proposed program at this stage, so preparing a detailed evaluation plan is not realistic. That will be required during the first year of the grant.

An evaluation process generally discusses how the applicant has already or will identify a person or persons or a department at their school or district who will assist with gathering, analyzing and/or reporting on each of the components to CDE. The process should outline how the applicant plans on identifying usable data sources or what has already been identified. It is not an expectation that applicants to have all the details of the evaluation ironed out at this stage.

The evaluation plan is a detailed roadmap of what will be implemented during the length of the grant. It should align with the program logic model and includes information on the evaluation questions that will be addressed during the evaluation. For each evaluation question or desired outcome tied to the question, subgrantees would identify the measures and tools that will be used, the benchmarks that the program is aiming for with the outcomes identified, each staff in charge of data collection, analysis, and reporting, timelines for collections and reporting, and how the data will be used. There is an example template here: <https://www.cde.state.co.us/21stcclc/subgranteeresources>.

If an applicant would like to submit an evaluation plan for that question in the grant application, it would fulfill that requirement. However, future evaluation plans should include other evaluation questions and outcomes relevant to the program in addition to those required for state reporting.

A. You could use Appendix E or follow the Monitoring, Evaluation, and Reporting section of the RFA.

A. It is an applicant-level decision on how they choose to answer the question. Reviewers will be assessing if the information provided meets the criteria outlined in the question.

# BUDGET

**Q. In the budget, what code should we use for transportation costs (leasing a mini-bus from the district to support programing and student transportation)? “Support – Other Purchased Services” , “Support – Travel, Registration and Entrance”, or something different entirely?**

A. If you are leasing the bus from an outside entity (not from the district), please use “Support – Other Purchased Services” as the object code for all related budget line items. If you are using district buses, please categorize all related budget line items, including mileage reimbursement, etc., as “Support – Travel, Registration and Entrance” for the object code.

Q. Should the program director’s salary be included in the 5% administrative program cost maximum outlined in the RFA?

A. The administrative cost maximum on the budget document is specifically for CBOs. Program directors should be allocated at the percentage of time that they spend working on the grant, and coded based on the unique job responsibilities the position.

Q. Should 21st CCLC program directors be coded as “support salaries” or “instructional salaries” on the budget document?

A. The instructional salary code is to be used for positions that provide direct instruction to students. Support salaries would be appropriate for positions that do not directly instruct students. A program director in a supervisory role that doesn’t directly instruct students would likely by coded as a support salary.

# SIGNATURES

**Q. We are in the process of completing our 21CCLC application…and had a question regarding the required signatures. Will CDE accept a signature from our Executive Director of Extended Learning and Community Schools in lieu of the superintendent signature on the Signature Page?**

A. As long as that person has the authority to commit the district to the assurances, partnership requirements and other grant mandates, we can accept their signature.

Q. For authorized representative signatures throughout the application, does it need to be the same person or can it be anyone who has signing privileges at our organization/district?

A. It should be the same person throughout and must be someone who has signatory authority for funding requests and reimbursements, if awarded.

Q. Would a CBO board president be an acceptable signatory for the GEPA statement, or does it need to be a Superintendent of the schools to be served and/or school board president?

A. If you are a CBO applicant, the President of the Board is an acceptable signatory.

Q. Does the superintendent of partnering school districts need to sign if the lead applicant is a CBO?

A. Yes, the superintendent of partnering schools does needs to sign the application. This is important for ensuring ongoing support from the partnering district.

**Q. We are a charter school. Our district superintendent tells us she cannot sign for our charter, even though they are our authorizer. Can you provide more information on who should be the authorizing agent for a charter school.**

A. Charter schools may submit an application through their authorizing school district or the Charter School Institute (CSI), per Colorado Revised Statutes (CRS 22-30.5-104). A charter school’s authorizer or CSI will be the fiscal agent if awarded funds. The fiscal agent will be held to the same maximum funded centers noted on page four of the RFA and all requirements found in the RFA.

**Q. All of the leaders who approved this grant application (Superintendent, BOE President, Principal) signed their parts of the application documents electronically. So I have electronic signatures and documentation of the authenticity of those signatures. How do I put those into survey monkey? I can snip the electronic signature and paste it in the application, but should I attach the authentication information in the appendices?**

A. You can upload the separate signature documents in the “Additional Document Uploads” area of Survey Monkey. In the signature areas of the online application, please write “see uploaded document.”

**Q. I am taking a look at the portal for the 21st Century application due next Wednesday (5/12). I noticed there is a space for the school principal and superintendent to sign in the SurveyMonkey. I anticipate some barriers to getting both parties to log in and sign as APDC is the lead agency and Hinkley is the partner. We have sent the template forms for both school representatives to sign. Is it acceptable for us to upload those pdfs in lieu of a signature in the actual portal?**

A. Yes, the principal and superintendent signatures can be upload to the “additional document uploads” page.

**Q. We will have a new Superintendent (AOR) on July 1. I assume its okay to keep the Interim Supt. Signature on this application since he will be the authorizer until then?**

A. Yes, the Interim Superintendent is the appropriate person for the signature.

**Q. Our institution plans on submitting a 21 CCLC proposal but are wondering if we have to get signatures from our President, our partner superintendent/principals on both the online application site as well as the general assurances form (appendix H). Is it acceptable to have a proxy sign into the application site so we do not need to have our President/principal/etc access that site? Can you please let us know? Thanks.**

A. Each superintendent and principal needs to sign the application on the “Center Expectation: Principal and Superintendent Sign-off Form.” This is important for ensuring ongoing support from the partnering district(s). Instead of asking them to access the system, you could email them a hard copy of that page and ask them to sign it and return it to you. Then you can upload it to the “Additional Document Uploads” area of Survey Monkey. In the signature areas of the online application, please write “see uploaded document.”

For the GEPA and other signature areas for the assurances, that would be your Organization’s CEO or Board President. In terms of proxies for the areas where your organization is signing off, as long as that person has the authority to commit the district or CBO to the assurances, partnership requirements and other grant mandates, we can accept their signature.

**Q. My question is, I just now received a signature (page 6 only) from one of the school principals I'm working with at our partner school. It's attached. I'm still waiting for the superintendent's signature. With that being said: 1. Is this page 6 only...acceptable? 2. Do I need to circle back and ask for the entire document for the Center/School #1 - Information and Signatures? I'm asking ahead on this one, in the event the superintendent provides only page 7.**

A. If you are asking if you need to upload all the pages in the Center/School #1 - Information and Signatures section, or if you can just upload the signature page: For the online application, you can just upload the page(s) containing the signature(s); the whole section containing multiple pages isn’t necessary. We assume that those signing the center/school information and signature pages have read the assurances and other information in this section prior to signing.

**Q. Can the Executive Director of Community Schools sign instead of the Superintendent of our district?**

A. If the person is considered an authorized signer for the District, that should be fine. An authorized signer is the person has the authority to commit the district to the assurances, partnership requirements and other grant mandates.

# APPLICATION SCORING

**Q. Is the Comprehensive ELT Plan scored? If so, what is the rubric? How many points? Is it appropriate to copy/paste pieces of the ELT Plan into Section D: Project Implementation? There is a lot of overlap, and ELT Plan is not scored, but has a lot of valuable information that strengthens the program piece of our narrative.**

A. Although your ELT model will be a part of your overall application responses throughout the document. The best connection points is Section D, question #1 (7 points) and #2 (5 points).

# ONLINE APPLICATION SYSTEM

Q. We are still gathering the appropriate signatures for each school (4 total); however, we have a couple questions about the application side. Since we are applying for four schools total, in three different school districts, how do we create three separate applications needed for each district? We successfully created one application for Park Lane Elementary; however, I’m not seeing how to create the application for our two Denver Schools and for the one school located in Sheridan. I'm unable to see the option to create an additional application for a different school district.

A. Applicants may apply for schools within several districts under one application. Applicants would denote how many schools will be included in the application (in this case, four schools) on the “Applicant Information” page within the online application. The question is: “How many centers (schools) will be funded (maximum number is 6)?”. The number input into this text field turns on the appropriate number of “Center/School Information and Signatures” pages in the proceeding section of the online application. On each of the “Center/School Information and Signatures” pages, applicants can denote which schools and districts will be served, and signatures of both school principals and district superintendents are required on these pages for each proposed center.

Applicants may also create separate applications for each district they wish to serve with the grant. Users can create one SurveyMonkey Apply account, but start and submit multiple applications under one account. Applicants can denote separate districts and schools to be served on the “Center/School Information and Signatures” pages following the steps listed in the paragraph above. If you are having issues creating multiple applications under your account, please use the “Support Center” function at the upper right corner of your SurveyMonkey Apply screen.

Q. In previous years, we have been able to include our end/reference notes separately in the submission and not have them count towards the total word count. Will this be the same approach this year? If not, is it recommended that we submit them in the Additional Document Uploads? If yes on the latter, is the Task Language still true for this approach: “Upload other documentation as needed. Please note that any additional documents provided by applicants will not be scored and reviewers are not obligated to consider any supplemental materials in their evaluation of the application. Please ensure that all necessary application elements appear in the narrative and required attachments.” What is a good approach here for our end/reference notes?

**Similar question: When using a variety of different sources for evidence and research, is there a designated spot for listing citations given the constraints of SurveyMonkey? Will it count towards the word count?**

A. Applicants may add citations, footnotes, and so forth at their discretion in multiple areas of the application. One option is to add the citations and footnotes at the end of each question response in each narrative section (see the screenshot below). Another option is to add internal references/citations throughout the narrative and, on the “Additional Document Uploads” page, upload a document page containing the bibliography/ endnotes for all references/citations within the narrative. Be advised that reviewers are not required to review and score anything above and beyond the narrative sections, including documents included in the “Additional Document Uploads”.



**Q. Can we add tables, graphs, and lists to the narrative boxes in the online application, and change the font or paragraph styles (bold, italic, underlined, indented, etc.)?**

Similar question: We like to use different charts (non-text) in the different narrative sections, and we only see one chart available under Section B in the narrative. If we wanted to use charts to make our narrative less word heavy (more colorful and easier to read!), what would be the best approach here knowing that if we submit reference materials in this section, Additional Document Upload area, they may not be viewed and or scored together. What would be a good approach here? We have reviewed the previous Q/A in the FAQ: Q. In the online application would we be able to submit tables if not, what can we do, can we send or upload tables as a PDF. If we cannot submit tables how can we submit the chart that is required with projected numbers for each center?

A. We have received multiple questions in this area. Unfortunately, SurveyMonkey is limited in this area. Applicants are able copy and paste bulleted lists from a Word or Adobe PDF document and the bullets should still appear in the narrative boxes. If not, applicants can add dashes to each new bullet to denote a list. Applicants can also copy and paste tables into the boxes so that text may appear in a grid, but applicants cannot change the width of the columns and the cells will not have outlines. Graphs and other visuals could be uploaded by applicants under the “Additional Document Uploads” page, but please be advised that reviewers are not required to review and score anything above and beyond the narrative sections. Paragraphs cannot be indented but each paragraph can be separated by a new blank line. Font styles cannot be changed but applicants can use capitalized words and so forth for emphasis.

**Q. Visual organization matters...Is there any way to format answers in Survey =Monkey? Ex: It would be helpful to have some sort of heading to frame parts of the narrative by underlining, or bolding etc. … If we are limited to plain text - what is the preferred formatting? (the online application doesn’t allow you to indent for paragraphs - should we separate with a double line space?) (can’t add bullet points for schedule outlines...)**

A. See answer above.

**Q. In the SurveyMonkey Application, Question 6 of Section H provides a text box (regarding the financial risk assessment)… are you looking for a brief narrative or description about the Risk Assessment Rubric, or do we just list our score?**

A. After filling out the assessment, please list the score in that area.

Q. How can applicants access additional support directly from SurveyMonkey?

A. Applicants can access the SurveyMonkey Apply “support center” at the upper right corner of their browser next to their account name.
 

Q. Will grant reviewers be made aware of formatting limitations within SurveyMonkey Apply?

A. Yes, grant reviewers will use the same system to review and will be trained on the structure of the online application and submitted applications. As a reminder, all applications will be submitted under the same formatting parameters of SurveyMonkey Apply.

**Q. Regarding Appendix F, I was planning on having the district’s grant team/manager fill out this form and sign demonstrating our history of financial compliance and competency, would that be the correct representative to fill out this form? Additionally, in SurveyMonkey it requests to upload financial documents, would this be our past AFR or a hyperlink for the entire district’s report on their financial standing?**

A. The authorized representative, who will be signing the application in other areas, should also sign the risk assessment. Applicants should submit their last audited report such as the financial statements for the most recent financial period at the organization level. Applicants can submit a hyperlink to these documents if it is available.

**Q. For the GEPA statement, I was told that for some grants applicants are asked to submit a write up/narrative of their own, but in the SurveyMonkey the way I understood it was that the guidelines are outlined and our requirements are to check the box demonstrating acknowledgment and agreement followed by a district representative signature? So my question in short is do we just need to read the terms, accept and check the box and add the signature?**

A. References to providing new/separate GEPA statements in the application have been removed. Applicants are required to check off on the assurances.

**Q. Is the budget narrative a separate upload?**

A. No, it is not a separate upload. There is a text box in the online application where you will be able to respond.

Q. In the online application would we be able to submit tables if not, what can we do, can we send or upload tables as a PDF. If we cannot submit tables how can we submit the chart that is required with projected numbers for each center?

A. A chart is formatted in the online application that you fill out with the information, it is similar in format to the one provided in the referenced hard copy.

Q. I am not able to add more than one center to the online application. Can you please tell us how to do this?

A. The number of center pages to be displayed are tied to the answer to the following question under the first page of “Applicant Information”:



For example, if you enter the number “3” in the box and click through the applicant pages, then the navigation pane on the left side should display three “Center/School – Information and Signature” sections.

**Q. Is there a specified font and size I should be using in this submission?**

No specific font or font size requirements. You will enter your application narrative responses into the online application system and it will default to the system font. The specific length requirements of the narrative are copied below.

Application Format (from page 15 of the RFA)

The total narrative (Sections A-H) of the application cannot exceed 17,000 words (the equivalent of 34 typed pages) in the online application, excluding any required attachments. Please see below for the required elements of the application. Applications that exceed 17,000 words cannot be submitted via SurveyMonkey Apply.

* The signature pages must include electronic signatures of the lead organization/fiscal agent.
* The submission of duplicate applications that are identical, except for names and descriptions of the eligible center, will not be accepted. Applications from applicants in the same district or working with the same collaborators may contain some common information, but the substantive elements of the application narrative must be unique to the eligible center(s).

**Q. I just had a quick question about the appendices within the Survey Monkey Apply, specifically those with tables in later sections of the application. I cannot skip forward to those sections to see what they look like in terms of inputting information. The appendices that we were to fill out are within tables and tables do not insert into the application system text boxes. Do those sections need to be readjusted out of the tables to input into Survey Monkey, or are those sections set up with tables in them already, like the chart of expected number of students in Section B?**

A. All of the appendices that need to be filled out are built out as separate pages as either an upload page or a fillable page in the online application. An applicant can enter “dummy” responses and save pages of the application to proceed through to see what the rest of the application looks like. Each page has clear instructions as to whether there is a document upload, or if applicants need to fill out the entire page with information.

For the dummy responses, you can input a word or two so it will let you move forward and you can see those sections further along in the application. You will be able to return to the earlier sections and enter full responses at any point.