6th Office Hours Session - April 9, 2021

Updates from the State Office:

* Extending the due date: 21st CCLC Grant Application now due Wednesday, May 12, 2021 by 11:59PM
* IF 21st CCLC receives additional federal/state funding, equitable distribution chart caps found on page four of the RFA will not be applied for that specific funding. The caps will continue to apply for 21st CCLC funding. See below.
* New layout for ongoing FAQ

**NEW ANNOUNCEMENT:**

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.*

**\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\***

**NEW QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS**

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

**SIMILAR QUESTION**

**Q. 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 SCOOP, we would recommend you sign up as this provides weekly updates on current grant competitions.  The link is:  [Colorado Department of Education (campaign-archive.com)](https://us5.campaign-archive.com/home/?u=bee6c43ae6102530cf98cadf9&id=ab7e1e5d57)  Click the --  join our mailing list.

A. 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 1st of the status of our application?**

**SIMILAR QUESTION**

**Q. 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**

**What is the fiscal year for each grant year, is it Sept 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-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. 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 <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. Our district liaison who navigates getting all the signatures from the Superintendent and Board President had reached out to Mandy Christensen at CDE to see if we could utilize a paper format for signatures. Mandy’s response was that paper signatures would be accepted and that the team would add a field to the application that would allow us to upload signature pages separately, and we should write “see attached” in the signature fields in Survey Monkey. I just want to double check – is the signature upload in “additional documents” section, or is there a different space that you would prefer the signature pages to be uploaded?**

A. Yes, please upload any hard copy signature pages in the “additional document uploads” section of the online application, and add “see attached document” to the signature fields within the online application.

**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. 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. 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. 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.

**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 at the link below. 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.

<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>.

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 at: https://www.cde.state.co.us/cdecomm/strategicplan.

**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. 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 highlighted by the national Afterschool Alliance. It can be found at http://bit.ly/2hPrOZn.

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.