APPENDIX 9: Scoring Rubric - 2024 Summer Strong

Program Description - 56 points (48 points + up to 8 possible priority points) Organization History, Leadership and Experience - 16 points Unacceptable or **Acceptable Excellent** Good Did Not Respond (1 point) (2 points) (3 points) (4 points) □ Details history and mission of organization □ Does not describe history and mission of □ Describes history and mission of □ Describes history and mission of AND organization organization organization □ Details directors, senior staff, and board AND OR AND members with broad expertise and □ Does not describe leadership staff with □ Describes leadership staff with broad □ Describes leadership staff with experience demonstrated years of commitment to youth broad expertise and commitment to youth. working with youth expertise and commitment to youth AND AND OR OR □ Details organization's approach and □ Does not describe organization's approach □ Describes the organization's approach or □ Describes the organization's approach or philosophy in implementing a youth philosophy towards youth development or philosophy towards youth development philosophy towards youth development development approach □ Detail key staff that will manage grant administration/funds and data management □ Describes key staff that will manage grant and analysis administration/funds and data management AND AND □ Provides examples of success in managing □ Describes key staff that will manage grant □ Provides examples of success in managing and/or complying with grant requirements administration/funds □ Does not describe key staff that will deliver and/or complying with grant requirements AND AND the program and manage grant AND □ Provides quantitative evidence of success □ Provides examples of success in managing □ Provides quantitative evidence of success administration/funds in managing and complying with grant and/or complying with grant requirements in managing and complying with grant requirements requirements **OR** Provides qualitative AND evidence of success in managing and □ Provides qualitative evidence of success in managing and complying with grant complying with grant requirements requirements

school and/or community to be served	□ Describes the program team, tenure, experience, and connection with the school and/or community to be served for a program that has been in place for at least one year	 □ Describes the program team, tenure, experience, and connection with the school and/or community to be served for a program that has been in place for at least three years AND □ Describes the capability of the program 	
□ Does <u>not</u> describe how the organization identifies structural racism	structural racism	AND □ Provides one example of work done by the organization to address structural racism in general	□ Details how the organization identifies structural racism AND □ Provides multiple examples of work done by the organization to dismantle structural racism within the specific community to be served

Unacceptable or	Acceptable	Good	Excellent
Did Not Respond (1 point)	(2 points)	(3 points)	(4 points)
□ Does <u>not</u> describe the targeted population to be served	□ Describes the targeted population to be served	□ Describes the targeted population to be served AND □ Describes why the organization is proposing to serve this population AND □ Describes how the proposed program will address the needs of youth	□ Details the targeted population to be served AND □ Details why the organization is proposing to serve this population AND □ Details how the proposed program will address the needs of underserved and/or "atrisk" youth AND □ Details accurately how the organization determines youth meet the definition of underserved/at-risk youth using definitions provided in RFA
	□ Describes how the program meets the need(s) of the priority school community	□ Describes how the program meets the need(s) of the priority school community AND □ Indicates if other OST options are available within the community	□ Details how the program meets the unique need(s) of the priority school community AND □ Details whether youth served would have other OST options if the program did not exist and, if so, examples of other program options
At-Risk/Underserved Popula	tion(s) to be Served* - up to	8 possible priority points(*Co	ompetitive Points)
Acceptable	Good	Great	Excellent
(1 point)	(2 points)	(3 points)	(4 points)
$\hfill \square$ 1- 25% of proposed youth to be served are living in poverty as demonstrated by eligibility for TANF, SNAP and/or Free- and Reduced-priced Meals	are living in poverty as demonstrated by	□ 50%-74% of proposed youth to be served are living in poverty as demonstrated by eligibility for TANF, SNAP and/or Free- and Reduced-priced Meals	□ 75%-100% of proposed youth to be served are living in poverty as demonstrated by eligibility for TANF, SNAP and/or Free- and Reduced-priced Meals
□ 1- 25% of proposed youth to be served are students with disabilities	□ 25%-49% of proposed youth to be served are students with disabilities	□ 50%-74% of proposed youth to be served are students with disabilities	□ 75%-100% of proposed youth to be served are students with disabilities

□ 1- 25% of proposed youth to be served are students who are immigrant, migrant and/or English Learners	□ 25%-49% of proposed youth to be served are students who are immigrant, migrant and/or English Learners	□ 50%-74% of proposed youth to be served are students who are immigrant, migrant and/or English Learners	□ 75%-100% of proposed youth to be served are students who are immigrant, migrant and/or English Learners
□ 1- 25% of proposed youth to be served identify as LGBTQ	□ 25%-49% of proposed youth to be served identify as LGBTQ	□ 50%-74% of proposed youth to be served identify as LGBTQ	□ 75%-100% of proposed youth to be identify as LGBTQ
□ 1- 25% of proposed youth to be served are experiencing homelessness	□ 25%-49% of proposed youth to be served are experiencing homelessness	□ 50%-74% of proposed youth to be served are experiencing homelessness	□ 75%-100% of proposed youth to be served are experiencing homelessness
□ 1- 25% of proposed students to be served are in foster care	□ 25%-49% of proposed youth to be served are in foster care	□ 50%-74% of proposed youth to be served are in foster care	□ 75%-100% of proposed youth to be served are in foster care
□ 1- 25% of proposed youth to be served are high school students that are one year older, or more, than the expected age for the grade in which they are enrolled.	□ 25%-49% of proposed youth to be served are high school students that are one year older, or more, than the expected age for the grade in which they are enrolled	□ 50%-74% of proposed youth to be served are high school students that are one year older, or more, than the expected age for the grade in which they are enrolled	□ 75%-100% of proposed youth to be served are high school students that are one year older, or more, than the expected age for the grade in which they are enrolled
□ 1- 25% of proposed students to be served reside in wards 4, 5, 6, 7, or 8	□ 25%-49% of proposed youth to be served reside in wards 4, 5, 6, 7, or 8	□ 50%-74% of proposed youth to be served reside in wards 4, 5, 6, 7, or 8	□ 75%-100% of proposed youth to be served reside in wards 4, 5, 6, 7, or 8
Program Design/Services - 8	points		
Unacceptable or	Acceptable	Good	Excellent
Did Not Respond (1 point)	(2 points)	(3 points)	(4 points)
I and the second		,	(· points)

□ Does <u>not</u> state any measurable objectives that the program will achieve	□ States one measurable objective that the program will achieve but does not identify the subject, behavior, assessement criteria and/or time period	□ States two measurable objective that the program will achieve and clearly identifies the subject, behavior, assessement criteria and time period	□ States three measurable objective that the program will achieve and clearly identifies the subject, behavior, assessement criteria and time period		
Youth Involvement - 8 points	Youth Involvement - 8 points				
Unacceptable or Did Not Respond (1 point)	Acceptable (2 points)	Good (3 points)	Excellent (4 points)		
□ Does <u>not</u> describe the strategies the program uses to recruit youth into the program or why recruitment is not an issue	 □ Describes the strategies the program uses to recruit youth into the program OR □ Explains why recruitment is not an issue 	□ Describes the strategies the program uses to recruit youth into the program OR □ Explains why recruitment is not an issue AND □ Describes successes encountered with recruitment strategies	□ Details clear and comprehensive strategies the program uses to recruit youth into the program, including how the strategies reach the target population OR □ Explains in detail why recruitment is not an issue AND □ Details if these recruitment strategies have been prievously used, and, if so, describes both the successes and challenges, or, if not, describes the rationale that suggests success		
□ Does <u>not</u> describe the strategies the program uses to retain youth or why retention is not an issue	1	 □ Describes the strategies the program uses to retain youth into the program OR □ Explains why retention is not an issue AND □ Describes successes or challenges encountered with retention strategies 	□ Details the strategies the program uses to retain youth into the program and how they are aligned with youth development OR □ Explains why recruitment is not an issue AND □ Details if these retention strategies have been prievously used, and, if so, describes both the successes and challenges, or, if not, describes the rationale that suggests success AND □ Details how being retained in the program benefits the youth		

Making Connections - 8 points			
Unacceptable or Did Not Respond (1 point)	Acceptable (2 points)	Good (3 points)	Excellent (4 points)
□ Does <u>not</u> describe how program supports youth with connecting to the larger community AND □ Does <u>not</u> describe reasons for not supporting youth with community connections	IOR	 □ Describes and provides at least one example of how the program supports youth with connecting to the larger community OR □ Describes rationale for not supporting youth with community connections 	 □ Details and provides multiple examples of how the program supports youth with connecting to the larger community AND □ Details how these connections benefit the youth OR □ Details reasonable rationale for not supporting youth with community connections
IAND	 □ Describes strategies the program will use to involve families OR □ Indicates why family engagement is not a component of programming 	 □ Describes strategies the program will use to involve families AND □ Describes previous successes involving families OR □ Provides reasons for why family engagement is not a component of programming 	□ Detail strategies the program will use to linvolve and engage families AND □ Details why family engagement is important to youth development AND □ Describes successes and challenges engaging families, including examples. If the strategies are new, describe the rationale that suggests success OR □ Provides valid reasons for why family engagement is not a component of programming but outlines plans to promote engagement.

Budget & Budget Narrative - 12 points Budget - 4 points				
□ Does <u>not</u> include budget item details	□ Includes budget item details	 □ Includes budget item details AND □ Some line item expenses are described and justified 	 □ Include budget item details, quantities and cost per unit for some expenses AND □ All line item expenses described and justified, including calculations 	
Budget Narrative - 8 points				
Unacceptable or	Acceptable	Good	Excellent	
Did Not Respond (1 point)	(2 points)	(3 points)	(4 points)	
□ Does <u>not</u> describe how the grant funds will be used	□ Describes how the grant funds will be used	□ Describes how the grant funds will be used and justifies costs	 □ Details how the grant funds will be used and justifies costs AND □ All expenses align with program activities and youth development outcomes 	
□ The cost per hour is <u>not</u> justified AND □ The cost per student is <u>not</u> justified	□ The cost per hour is justified OR □ The cost per student is justified	□ The cost per hour is justified AND □ The cost per student is justified	 □ The cost per hour is justified AND □ The cost per student is justified AND □ The justifications align with youth development outcomes 	

TOTAL POINTS

/ 68 points (60 points + up to 8 priority points)