

# Fiscal Year 2024 (FY24) 21st Century Community Learning Centers (CCLC) Grant Competition Questions and Answers



This document contains answers to questions received by the Office of the State Superintendent of Education (OSSE) after the 21st CCLC pre-application webinars hosted in July 2023. Answers pertain to the FY24 Nita M. Lowey 21st CCLC grant competition. Information about the grant competition, including the request for applications and all supplemental application materials are available on the OSSE website ([click here](#)).

***This document was updated on Aug. 9, 2023***

## Contents

<b>Grant Competition Questions and Answers</b> .....	1
Table of Common Acronyms .....	2
Enterprise Grants Management System (EGMS).....	2
Application .....	2
Program Operations.....	3
Writing the Application.....	4
Statutory Priorities.....	5
Competitive Priorities .....	5
Evaluation (Program and Third-Party) .....	8
Performance Measures (GPRA and Program-Specific).....	9
Indicator-Specific Questions .....	15
Nonpublic Schools.....	16
Partnerships and Partner Attestation Forms.....	16
Budget and Carryover .....	18

## Table of Common Acronyms

Acronym	Meaning
21st CCLC	21st Century Community Learning Centers
CBO	Community-Based Organization
EGMS	Enterprise Grants Management System
GPA	Grade Point Average
GPRA	Government Performance and Results Act
LEA	Local Education Agency
OSSE	Office of the State Superintendent of Education
PARCC	Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers
RFA	Request for Applications

## Enterprise Grants Management System (EGMS)

**EGMS-1. In EGMS, Attachment C doesn't allow me to enter the information. Text boxes are missing.** Attachment C only becomes available to complete after Attachments A and B are completed. Complete and save Attachments A and B before returning to Attachment C.

**EGMS-2. Although the application on EGMS is listed with a due date of Aug. 11, 2023, the due date listed in the EGMS application, on the "Overview" tab is June 28, 2023. When is the application due?** The application is due at 12 p.m. EST on Aug. 11, 2023.

***EGMS-2 response updated Aug. 9, 2023***

The application is due at 12 p.m. EST on Aug. 23, 2023.

## Application

**A-1. I saw in the notice of funding opportunity that single schools within a local education agency (LEA) cannot apply for this grant opportunity. We are a single-site LEA. Are we eligible to apply or are only multi-site LEAs eligible?**

LEAs are eligible to apply for 21st CCLC funding, including single-site LEAs. Please review the eligibility criteria in the [request for applications](#) for additional information.

**A-2. If an applicant does not receive an award in FY24, will they be able to apply next year, or will the competition only occur every five years?**

Future competitions have not been scheduled by OSSE at this time.

**A-3. I notice there's \$6 million available for funding and that DC Public Schools' (DCPS') current grant will expire, thus making them eligible to apply. In the most recent round, DCPS received \$4.5 million.**

**Although this is a competitive grant application, I can't imagine DCPS not receiving a similar award. With that in mind, how many grant awards does OSSE plan to make, and is there an anticipated average award size?**

Grant awards are determined through a competitive application process and no applicant or organization receives guaranteed funding. Applications are evaluated by expert third-party reviewers using the published [scoring rubric](#). The [notice of funding availability](#) states that "OSSE anticipates making six–10 new awards." No average award size has been projected.

## Program Operations

### *Hours of Operation*

**PO-1. Can we exceed the minimum days, weeks and hours per year requirements?**

Yes. The minimum hours of operation outlined on pages 11 and 12 of the [request for applications](#) may be exceeded by the subgrantee. Please note that minimum hours of operation are per community learning center ("site").

**PO-2. Can our program offer fewer than the minimum number of hours per day but offer programming more days per week and weeks per year so that we meet or exceed the number of total hours required of the program?**

Yes. Programs may propose a site schedule that meets or exceeds the minimum number of hours per school year while offering fewer hours of programming on a per-day basis than is outlined in the RFA.

**PO-3. For the minimum hours requirement for elementary school programming, if a program meets five days a week but 2.5 hours for four days and 4.5 hours for the fifth day, would we still be eligible?**

Yes. Programs may propose a site schedule that meets or exceeds the minimum number of hours per school year while offering fewer hours of programming on a per-day basis than is outlined in the RFA.

### *Additional Questions*

**PO-4. When calculating whether 75 percent of students have attended the program, how many days do they have to be attending or how many total hours must they have attended?**

This rate is calculated based on the number of hours a student attends 21st CCLC programming over the course of the school year based on their grade of enrollment (elementary school, middle school, or high school). A student is counted as a regular participant if they attend for a minimum number of hours based on their grade:

- Elementary School: 50 days (or 150 hours) during the school year;
- Middle School: 30 days (or 90 hours) during the school year; or
- High School: 20 days (or 60 hours) during the school year.

Students who meet these minimum hours count toward whether a subgrantee is serving the number of students proposed in the application.

**PO-5. The request for applications seems to favor paper attendance records. Are grantees allowed to utilize digital tracking tools?**

OSSE is neutral about whether an applicant proposes to collect and store data using paper or electronic records.

**PO-6. In the event of award, grantees are expected to provide a certificate of insurance. Are there liability limits? What name and address should we place in the certificate holder's box?**

OSSE has not established a liability limit, but does provide in the [Post-Application Documentation](#), the guidance that "applicants must maintain sufficient insurance to protect the items purchased through federal funds and against accidents that may occur on the property." In the certificate holder's box, the applicant may provide to the insurer this information:

District of Columbia Government  
Office of the State Superintendent of Education  
21st Century Program

If your insurer also requests a physical address for the certificate holder, please provide:

1050 First St. NE  
Washington, DC 20002

**PO-7. We are an organization looking to support programming in Baltimore. Is this funding opportunity only available for DC public schools?**

While the applicant does not need to be headquartered in the District of Columbia, the community learning centers must be in DC and serve DC students. Eligible entities include LEAs; community-based organizations (CBOs); Indian tribes or tribal organizations; another public or private entity; or a consortium of two or more such eligible agencies, organizations, or entities. You may contact Maryland's state education agency (SEA) about 21st CCLC funding for programs in Baltimore.

## Writing the Application

**W-1. How should we incorporate/integrate our organization's management of past 21st CCLC grants in this application? Can we present comparative data from previous 21st CCLC grants to demonstrate the effectiveness of our program design? We were instructed not to include these data in our previous application. We would like to confirm if it's permissible or not.**

OSSE provides no supplemental guidance about what an applicant should include in their application materials beyond what is included in the request for applications or any related documents. All applications will be scored based on the [FY24 21st CCLC Scoring Rubric](#).

**W-2. In the application, the question for section 3.8 says "For each proposed 21st CCLC site, describe how the proposed 21st CCLC program directly supports the school improvement plan of each school served. We are given 1,500 characters." Our organization has seven to eight feeder schools with just**

**one principal school, where 80–85 percent of Out of School Time (OST) students are drawn. Due to character limitations, how can we answer this question fully?**

All applicants have the same character limit when responding to prompts, and all answers must conform to the limitations. It is likely that school improvement plans contain similarities in content if not in language, and connections may be made between the proposed 21st CCLC program and the improvement plan of each school. Applicants are not required to provide quoted language from any of the school improvement plans but may summarize or categorize (e.g., attendance or academic improvement) how the proposed program aligns with the plans to appropriately answer the question within the given space. Applicants may also choose to utilize more characters of the response when connecting the proposed program to the improvement plan of the school(s) where most students are enrolled.

## Statutory Priorities

**SP-1. The first Statutory Priority in the RFA says that we should target services to students at schools as identified in the Investment in Schools and School Support Under the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). The link that you shared in the RFA shows several school designations. For instance, there's Comprehensive Support and Improvement – Low Performing Schools and Targeted Support and Improvement Schools (TSI). How will you score the school or schools we choose to partner with? Does one designation carry a higher priority over another? Or are they all scored equally?**

Scores are not assigned based on the category of support an identified school receives. If a proposed site serves a school that is not on the list, the option "N/A" is available for selection.

## Competitive Priorities

**CP-1. How many competitive priorities may an applicant select?**

An applicant may select zero, one, or two competitive priorities. Competitive priorities are optional, but applicants may receive additional points on their score by selecting and satisfactorily providing a narrative description of how the competitive priority is or will be met by the applicant.

**CP-2. Does competitive priority four have to serve middle school and high school students? Or, if we are a Pre-K 3 through grade 8 LEA, is it okay if we only serve middle school students?**

~~An organization may select and be considered for competitive priority four that only serves middle school students and not both middle and high school students. Additionally, a program proposing to only serve elementary school students may select this option if the application demonstrates how the proposed evidence-based early intervention in elementary school grades will lead to the same outcomes for students when they are enrolled in middle or high school at a later time. Organizations that select this priority and serve elementary school students and middle and/or high school students must provide the selected intervention(s) to middle and/or high school students but is not required to provide intervention(s) that align to competitive priority four with its elementary school population.~~

***CP-2 response updated Aug. 9, 2023***

As a Pre-K 3 through grade 8 LEA, you may select priority four but funds must only serve your middle school students. Based on the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act, the fourth competitive priority is

reserved for middle and/or high school programs. Applicants that only serve elementary school students may not select the fourth competitive priority.

**CP-3. Can elementary-only programs select competitive priority four, or only programs that serve middle and high school students? Could an elementary program select a program that would help elementary school students served in the 21st CCLC program to meet these goals when they get to middle school? If elementary school only programs cannot select this priority, they are unlikely to be funded due to the highly competitive nature of the grant. Is this intended?**

~~A program proposing to only serve elementary school students may select this option if the application demonstrates how the proposed evidence-based early intervention in elementary school grades will lead to the same outcomes for students when they are enrolled in middle or high school at a later time. Organizations that select this priority and serve elementary school students and middle and/or high school students must provide the selected intervention(s) to middle and/or high school students but is not required to provide intervention(s) that align to competitive priority four with its elementary school population.~~

***CP-3 response updated Aug. 9, 2023***

Based on the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act, the fourth competitive priority is reserved for middle and/or high school programs. Applicants that only serve elementary school students may not select the fourth competitive priority.

**CP-4. Can you elaborate on what it means to be in a consortium agreement versus a memorandum of understanding in competitive priority five? Can you clarify how we would we submit our application jointly with the Title I LEA?**

A consortium agreement is different than a memorandum of understanding or a partnership. A consortium agreement is a legally binding agreement between two or more eligible entities where the parties jointly develop the proposal and agree to cooperatively manage the program, including joint coordination of financial resources. A partnership agreement is not a legally binding document but does outline the roles and responsibilities of the different signatories. To be eligible for competitive priority five, a consortium is required and at least one party of the consortium agreement must be an LEA that receives Title I, Part A, funds and one party must be a public or private community organization. For this grant application, self-developed memorandums of understanding do not qualify as partnership agreements, and all partners must sign the partnership attestation form available in the [request for applications](#) and [on the OSSE website](#).

**CP-5. Does your application give equal priority to applications that propose to serve populations at community-based sites or in school settings?**

Yes, equal priority is given to applications that propose to serve populations at community-based sites or in school settings. There is no difference in points that may be awarded to an application that proposes to serve students on a school's campus or in a community-based site, and applicants may submit applications where one or more site is a school and one or more other site(s) is a community-based site.

**CP-6. The fourth competitive priority includes language about middle and high school students only, but it has been communicated that elementary school serving programs may also apply under this priority. Aren't those federal dollars tied to middle and high school youth? I'm questioning the**

**fairness of broadening the eligibility criterion to elementary school age children especially since programs like ours have years developing recruitment and retention of middle and high schoolers.** Based on the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act, the fourth competitive priority is reserved for middle and high school programs. Applicants serving elementary school students only may **not** select the fourth competitive priority.

**CP-7. If the applicant already uses the Forum for Youth Investment’s Program Quality Assessment (PQA) tool as part of its program, but this is not in its formal performance measure, does it still qualify for these priority points? Or does the applicant need to make this one of its performance indicators?**  
An applicant requesting points under the third competitive priority does not need to relate one of the optional performance measures to PQA.

**CP-8. For the fifth priority, the RFA states: “Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Section 4204(i)(1) identifies the following application priorities: Students who primarily attend schools that: I)Are implementing comprehensive support and improvement activities or targeted support and improvement activities under section 1111(d) (be designated for school improvement by OSSE under its Investment in Schools(IIS) methodology, the list of these schools is available on OSSE’s website) or other schools determined by the local educational agency to be in need of intervention and support to improve student academic achievement and other outcomes; and II) Enroll students who may be at risk for academic failure, dropping out of school, involvement in criminal or delinquent activities, or who lack strong positive role models.”** However, priority five only states that applicants who propose to serve schools that are designated for school improvement receive these priority points. The list of these schools is less than those who are (a) implementing a comprehensive support and improvement plan and significantly less than (b) those who may be at risk for academic failure, dropping out of school, involvement in criminal or delinquent activities, or who lack strong positive role models. Does an applicant receive priority points for (a) and (b) or just those on the specific list? And, if it does not receive priority points, does the need at each school as designated in Attachment A school site list carry additional weight? For example, is the applicant more competitive if the schools it serves have higher numbers by any of the factors on attachment A, including STAR designation and Title I Improvement? For example, is an applicant more competitive if two of the schools it will serve are designated CSI-1 or CSI-2 but it does not select this priority point (since it is only allowed two?). First, based on the [FY24 21st CCLC Scoring Rubric](#) document, varying points are not awarded on Attachment A based on the designation of each school. Second, the statutory priorities and the competitive priorities should not be construed as the same content in different language; the statutory priorities and the competitive priorities are distinct. Therefore, parallels should not be drawn between statutory priority A and the fifth competitive priority. For information about the use of statutory requirements in the application process, please review the document [FY24 21st CCLC Competition Award Procedures](#). In order to request and receive points under the fifth competitive priority, an application must meet each of the three criterion identified with bullet points.

**CP-9. For competitive priority three, in narrative section C2, are you looking for a specific implementation or use of the PQA? It’s our understanding that the PQA has been a requirement for evaluation in past application cycles. For context, priority three reads as follows: “The applicant proposes to use the Forum for Youth Investment’s PQA tool within their program evaluation.”**

OSSE has not provided guidance in the application documentation about the most appropriate use of the PQA assessment tool within subgrantee organizations. The subgrantee organization should use its own assessment of needs to determine the most appropriate use of the PQA.

## Evaluation (Program and Third-Party)

**E-1. In reading the 21st CCLC RFA and the application guidance document, there appears to be conflicting information about evaluations. The RFA says external evaluations should occur after years one, three and five. The guidance says “periodic evaluations” must be conducted annually. Can you please describe how these are different?**

The third-party evaluator must work with the subgrantee throughout the life of the program. At the end of program years one, three and five, the third-party evaluator and the subgrantee must produce and publish a formal program evaluation that includes, at a minimum, the information outlined in the RFA. However, subgrantees are expected to routinely assess their performance and use that information to modify, improve and strengthen the programming and activities offered; at a minimum these assessments must occur once per year, but the findings of these periodic evaluations do not need to be shared with OSSE after years two and four and do not need to be produced in the outlined format on pages 22–23. These assessments are different from the quarterly reports submitted to OSSE and annual reports to the US Department of Education.

**E-2. There is some conflicting language in the RFA about the third-party evaluation. On Page 22 there are both references to an evaluation that occurs in years one, three, and five and “an annual evaluation report.” What is included in the annual evaluation report? Please clarify what the evaluation requirements are and the timing of evaluation reports.**

Please review the answer to the preceding question.

**E-3. Can you clarify the role of third-party evaluators in years two and four? It seems the evaluator, at a minimum, is needed in those years to collect, analyze and report data on the performance measures needed for 21 Annual Performance Report (APR). Are there other responsibilities of the evaluator in those years? Can a subgrantee choose to conduct a full external evaluation in all five years using grant funds?**

The third-party evaluator must work with the subgrantee throughout the life of the program, including in years two and four. The third-party evaluator will support the subgrantee with data collection, analysis and reporting in all five years, including the development of evaluation reports after years one, three and five, which are shared with OSSE. Applicants may propose that the third-party evaluator produce a formal report after years two and four as well, though the final reports would not need to be shared with OSSE. Throughout the life of the program, the third-party evaluator will work with the subgrantee to prepare data and reports for annual submission to the US Department of Education (in the 21APR online portal) and quarterly reports submitted to OSSE (in the Quickbase portal). The details of the relationship between the subgrantee and the third-party evaluator will vary depending on the needs and capacity of each subgrantee organization.

**E-4. Annual evaluation reports are now required in odd grant years (one, three and five), correct? But data must still be tracked for all years?**



Yes. It is essential that all subgrantees collect and analyze program-, site- and student-level data on a regular basis. While third-party evaluation reports are only submitted after years one, three and five, all subgrantees will also submit quarterly reports to OSSE and annual reports to the US Department of Education. Data must be tracked throughout the life of the program to meet reporting requirements.

**E-5. Is there a cap or maximum percentage of the grant dedicated to external evaluation?**

Yes. The [21st CCLC Frequently Asked Questions](#) document states that the “total cost for the third-party evaluation cannot exceed 8 percent of the award amount.” The cap applies to each individual year’s award amount and the total award amount over five years.

**E-6. How much should be spent on evaluation? In the past, I believe the guidance was roughly 8 percent of our budget.**

The [21st CCLC Frequently Asked Questions](#) document states that the “total cost for the third-party evaluation cannot exceed 8 percent of the award amount.” The cap applies to each individual year’s award amount and the total award amount over five years.

**E-7. Regarding the section “Trainings for Third-Party Evaluators” (page 20), will these be required during years two and four as well as years one, three and five?**

Yes. As stated in the RFA, “third-party evaluators must attend two annual training sessions coordinated or offered by OSSE during each annual award period.”

## Performance Measures (GPRA and Program-Specific)

### *Performance Measures – General*

**PM-1. The FY24 application guidance says that applicants can add one to two measures in addition to the GPRA measures, but the [Performance Measures](#) document says five. Which is correct?**

Applicants may add up to two—not five—optional performance measures in EGMS in addition to the required performance measures related to the GPRA measures.

**PM-2. Are points awarded for performance indicators beyond the required number of GPRA?**

No. Applicants that write up to two additional performance measures do not receive any supplemental points for doing so. These performance measures are unscored but must conform to the requirements outlined in the [FY24 Application Guidance](#) document.

**PM-3. I do not see any mention of the key performance indicators (KPI) discussed in our last meeting with the American Institutes for Research (AIR). Does this mean that those will not be implemented in FY24? I'm specifically asking about the school day teacher survey, which OSSE had proposed adding questions to. According to this RFA, the only teacher survey data we need to report on is "engagement in learning" as appears in GPRA five. Is this correct?**

OSSE's current 21st CCLC subgrantees participated in feedback meetings with the AIR about data collection and progress monitoring. These conversations included draft key performance indicators that OSSE may use to help programs align data collection and analysis to national measures of effectiveness for 21st CCLC programs. These KPIs are not included in the request for applications, and any information discussed in relation to them, including teacher surveys, is not included in the application. The only teacher survey data that must be collected and reported, as outlined in the RFA, is about student "engagement in learning" as related to GPRA five.

**PM-4. Are all prior state performance measures gone?**

Yes. In prior years, OSSE utilized state performance measures to help subgrantees track progress toward uniform benchmarks. These have been retired and replaced with the federal GPRA measures.

**PM-5. When revising the GPRA measures to account for our grade levels served, can we also remove the reference to summer if we are not applying for a summer program?**

Yes, this revision may be made where appropriate.

**PM-6. In the sample performance measure table on page 28 of the RFA, the "Program's Performance Indicator" does not include a numeric target for the GPA measure. Is this an oversight? Shouldn't all the performance indicators include a numeric target?**

No. Please see the response to question PM-5.

**PM-7. The direction given in the grant pre-application webinar training was to use the GPRA as listed in the RFA as our outcomes, changing only the target age group being assessed, as needed. For GPRA measure two, can we add younger grades, or can we only change the outcome measure by choosing the applicable group within the age range grades, for example 7-8 but not 10-12?**

When adjusting the grades being served, the maximum grades measured should be those listed in the GPRA measure as presented. Earlier grades should not be added. For example, a program that only offers programming to elementary school students would not be required to report data related to the second GPRA measure.

**PM-8. Can you explain the timing of 21APR data entry for summer programs? If in FY24 my program runs a school year program (2023–24 school year) and a summer program (summer 2024), it seems logical that the prior year to current year data that I would report on for summer 2024 would be the 2023–24 and 2024–25 school years (i.e., the school years before and after summer 2024), respectively. But the prior year to current year periods for my school year program participants would be 2022–23 to 2023–24. I will not have 2024–25 school year data until summer/fall 2025, so I would be unable to report on summer 2024 in the FY24 21APR reporting period in mid- to late-2024. Is this correct? This would mean that in the first year I will be able to report on the school year only in the 21APR. In subsequent years two through five, I would be able to report on the school year and the prior summer in the 21APR. And I will have to wait a full year after my last summer program in year five to have the data to be able to report in the APR.**

This assessment of reporting requirements related to 21APR is correct. Because the 21APR data submission includes the most recently completed school and the summer preceding it, there would be no summer data available to report during the first data submission period.

**PM-9. Can the performance measures overlap with the objectives? The RFA calls for five to seven performance measures and six to eight measurable objectives.**

Yes, performance measures can overlap with the objectives. Subgrantees must have the six required performance measures (based on the five GPRA measures, as the first GPRA measure is split into performance measures 1a and 1b). Optionally, programs may write up to two additional program-specific performance measures/objectives. There are no other performance measures or objectives that an applicant needs to develop or write when preparing this application.

**PM-10. If our organization chooses to write any additional measures, should we include targets? Targets do not appear to be included in OSSE's GPRAs.**

Targets are not included in OSSE's GPRA measures. Organizations that include optional performance measures in addition to the GPRA measures must write their measures using specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and time-bound (SMART) formatting. Setting a target against which to measure progress is a component of writing a SMART-formatted performance measure. For additional information, please review the [FY24 Application Guidance](#) document.

**PM-11. In the RFA Appendix B: Performance Measures, there are 5 GPRA measures. Page 27 mentions that "each application is REQUIRED to address all five GPRA measures." For organizations serving a specific grade band (high school) and not the entire K-12 continuum - are they still eligible to apply if they can't meet all five GPRA measures?**

Yes. An organization that is proposing to only serve grades that are not included in a GPRA measure is not required to address the GPRA measure in the application and may enter "N/A - Not serving the included grade levels" in any text field where information may be required.

**PM-12. The first required performance measure is "Percentage of students in grades 4–8 participating in 21st CCLC programming during the school year and summer who demonstrate growth in reading and language arts on state assessments." Is there a specific percentage of improvement that OSSE has set for DC? It seems that every grantee gets to set their own rates of improvement. The document "Performance Measures" states, "For each performance measure, choose a performance target based on your needs assessment. Performance targets should be reasonable yet challenging." How should we accommodate this in the GPRA measures?**

OSSE has not determined a specific minimum level of growth or improvement to be counted toward the GPRA measures; any student who demonstrates growth or improvement may be counted. However, subgrantees may choose to hold themselves to higher levels of accountability. The referenced language in the Performance Measures document should not be written as such.

*GPRA Performance Measures 1a and 1b – Reading and Math Growth*

**PM-13. The first required performance measure is "Percentage of students in grades 4–8 participating in 21st CCLC programming during the school year and summer who demonstrate growth in reading**

and language arts on state assessments.” Is there a specific percentage of improvement that OSSE has set for DC? It seems that every grantee gets to set their own rates of improvement. The document “[Performance Measures](#)” states, “For each performance measure, choose a performance target based on your needs assessment. Performance targets should be reasonable yet challenging.” How should we accommodate this in the GPRA measures?

OSSE has not determined a specific minimum level of growth or improvement to be counted toward the GPRA measures; any student who demonstrates growth or improvement may be counted. However, subgrantees may choose to hold themselves to higher levels of accountability. The referenced language in the Performance Measures document should not be written as such.

**PM-14. Can you explain what growth on the state assessments means in GPRA 1a and 1b? Does that mean increasing a performance level (1–5) from year to year? Or something else?**

The Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC) is the statewide math and English language arts assessment administered annually in DC. PARCC scale scores range from 650 to 850 for all tests. These scales align to a performance level score between one and five. Because the scales within each level are wide, they may not provide an effective way to determine whether a student has improved. At this time, OSSE is finalizing its business rules for calculating growth and will support subgrantees with making these determinations after awards have been administered.

If the subgrantee is not an LEA, the level of PARCC data detail a subgrantee receives from the partner LEA(s) may vary. Under these circumstances, a subgrantee should work with their third-party evaluator to make a proper determination and may consult with OSSE for additional guidance about determining a student’s improvement on the PARCC assessment.

**PM-15. For GPRA 1a and 1b, does OSSE have a preference on how year-to-year growth is defined for PARCC assessments? Should we look at whether a student increases their performance level (growth between levels) from year to year? Or their scaled score? Some other measure? What about students who were at the highest level in the prior year? If they maintain a score at the highest level, should they be counted as “demonstrated growth” or excluded from the denominator completely? Does OSSE dictate these business rules in the calculation of this GPRA performance measure, or is the grantee allowed to come up with their own definitions for what demonstrated growth means in this context?**

OSSE has determined that any amount of growth is reflective of growth and may be counted toward the achievement reporting of this GPRA measure. At this time, OSSE is finalizing its business rules for calculating these measures and will support subgrantees with making these calculations after awards have been administered. OSSE will work with subgrantees to make proper determinations about calculations that reflect fair and equitable guidelines for accurate reporting.

**PM-16. For GPRA measure indicators 1a and 1b, if we are collecting data on all elementary school students we work with, including grades 2–3 but the GPRA measure is grades 4–8, should we change to grades 2–5? Or do we just change to grades 4–5? How do we state this measure in our application?**

The state assessment for math and English language arts in the District of Columbia is the PARCC assessment, which is only administered to elementary school students in grades 3–5. However, this GPRA indicator requires year-over-year comparisons; therefore, you will only be able to report this data for elementary students in grades 4 and 5. The revision of this GPRA measure, for a program that only

serves elementary school students, should be for grades 4–5. OSSE will work with all subgrantees to determine appropriate ways to identify growth for all students, for internal tracking, after award decisions have been made.

#### *GPRA Performance Measure 2 – (Grade Point Average) GPA*

**PM-17. Our school does not calculate GPA for elementary and middle school students. How should programs serving those students handle the GPA-related GPRA?**

GPA's are a mechanism to determine a student's overall academic performance based on the grades received in each class. Some schools may not grade students or may not calculate GPA's for students. However, students likely receive some type of mark for their performance relative to the academic standards of the course. When preparing the application, subgrantees should not adjust the phrase "... unweighted GPA of less than 3.0 who demonstrated an improved GPA" in the measure. Applicants who become subgrantees will be provided with additional information and support to make the proper determinations about calculating and submitting an equivalent measure to GPA.

**PM-18. For GPRA two (GPA): DCPS does not calculate GPA for students in elementary or middle school. If a subgrantee serves only elementary and/or middle school students, can the program performance indicator aligned with GPRA two be written in reference to fall to spring course grade improvement (e.g., "X percent of students will increase their course grades from fall to spring, or maintain an A, in their math and ELA courses"), instead of any reference to GPA?**

No. Please see the response to question PM-16.

**PM-19. It appears that in the sample performance measures table on page 28 that the denominator of the GPA GPRA measure is written incorrectly in the "Metrics" column. In the 21APR, the denominator for this metric is the number of students with a prior year GPA of less than 3.0, not all students who participated at least one day, as shown on the bottom right of page 28. We just want to make sure if that is a typo that applicants do not copy the language and run calculations as written in this table.**

In order to calculate growth from a prior-year GPA to a current-year GPA, the subgrantee must have data from both the current and the preceding year. The questioner is correct that the calculation is based on the number of students who participated in current year programming for whom data is available in the prior year in order to properly calculate year-over-year change in GPA.

**PM-20. The direction given in the grant session was to use the GPRA as listed in the RFA as our outcomes, changing only the target age group being assessed, as needed. For GPRA measure 2, can we add younger grades, or can we only change the outcome measure by choosing the applicable group within the age range grades, for example grades 7–8 but not grades 10–12?**

Only choose the applicable group within the age range grades of the GPRA measure.

#### *GPRA Performance Measure 3 – Attendance*

**PM-21. For GPRA measure three, if we do not currently track school day attendance, do we need to do that with this application? Is this a required performance measure?**

Yes, this is correct. This GPRA measure is required by the US Department of Education, and all subgrantees must collect and report on this information. A strong working relationship with the LEA(s) served by your organization is essential to properly collect this information and report on this measure.

#### *GPRA Performance Measure 4 – Suspensions*

**PM-22. For GPRA four, how do we know whether a student has been suspended unless a student tells us?**

Applicants that are not LEAs must upload partner attestation form(s) signed by an authorized representative from all LEA(s) where a majority of the proposed students are enrolled. These must be uploaded as part of the application in EGMS. Subgrantees and the LEAs where students are enrolled (if the subgrantee is not an LEA) must both be aware of their roles and responsibilities to implement a successful 21st CCLC program, including needs and protocols around data sharing.

#### *GPRA Performance Measure 5 – Teacher-Reported Improvement in Student Engagement in Learning*

**PM-23. For GPRA five, in the teacher survey, if a teacher indicates that a student “did not need to improve” (i.e., they were already at an acceptable level at the beginning of the year), should those students be counted among the group of students who demonstrated improvement, or are they to be excluded from the denominator completely?**

OSSE has determined that any amount of growth is reflective of growth and may be counted toward the achievement reporting of this GPRA measure. At this time, OSSE is finalizing its business rules for calculating these measures and will support subgrantees with making these calculations after awards have been administered. OSSE will work with subgrantees to make proper determinations about calculations that reflect fair and equitable guidelines for accurate reporting.

**PM-24. For GPRA five, does the teacher survey question have to specifically use the term “engagement in learning” or can we ask about something more tangible like “participation in class”?**

OSSE has worked with AIR to develop a specific assessment to be used for this measure that is based on the Survey of Academic and Youth Outcomes-Teacher (SAYO-T) survey. The survey consists of six questions, two of which ask teachers to rate the “extent to which the student changed their performance in relation to grade level standards” in math and English language arts and four questions ask teachers to rate “to what extent [the] student changed their behavior” in terms of focus, active participation and motivation.

**PM-25. For GPRA five, how do we measure teachers’ reports of student engagement in learning in summer? The 21APR teacher survey is administered to school-year teachers only.**

OSSE has worked with AIR to develop a specific assessment to be used for this measure that is based on the SAYO-T survey. The [21APR New GPRA Final Implementation Guide](#) outlines guidance about completing data reporting for each GPRA measure, including the fifth measure. According to the implementation guide, data from teacher surveys is “entered once for the summer and once for the school year.” Subgrantees must work with their third-party evaluator to determine the proper protocols for collecting and analyzing the information required to report on this measure, and OSSE will provide additional guidance to subgrantees after award determinations have been made.

**PM-26. For GPRA measure four, if we do not currently track school day suspensions, do we need to do that with this application? Is this a required a performance measure?**

Yes, this is correct. This GPRA measure is required by the US Department of Education and all subgrantees must collect and report on this information. A strong working relationship with the LEA(s) served by your organization is essential to properly collect this information to be able to report on this measure.

#### *Optional Performance Measures – Up to Two*

**PM-27. How much leeway do applicants have in revising the language of the GPRA measures to become their program’s performance indicators? The instruction on page 27 says to “Revise the GPRA measure to accurately include the grades your program is serving.” Can applicants make revisions other than to grade levels? For example, can the Performance Indicator be written to apply only to frequently attending participants? Can the Performance Indicator be written to reference an interim assessment like Achievement Network (ANET) instead of a state assessment like PARCC for GPRA 1a and 1b? I understand we will still have to report on the GPRA measures as written in the 21APR, but for the purposes of the program’s performance measures, are revisions acceptable to more closely align with the applicant’s programming and goals?**

No. Subgrantees should only adjust the grades served to align with the actual program.

**PM-28. Can you have a different set of targets/performance measures for summer versus school year programming? We expect a short summer program may have less influence on the GPRA-related outcomes than a school year program.**

No. Subgrantees should only adjust the grades served to align with the actual program.

#### Indicator-Specific Questions

**I-1. The question for indicator 4.4 says “Describe how the proposed program will help students meet state and local student achievement standards.” The guidance given in the grant session was that there are no separate applicable state/local performance standards and applicants are to use GPRA as their objectives. Do we use GPRA to answer the question?**

This question references state and local academic achievement standards in math and English language arts. As described in the RFA, this references the [Common Core standards](#) at the state level. Local student achievement standards may be set by each student’s LEA.

**I-2. Since the guidance in the grant information session was that there are no separate applicable state/local performance standards and applicants are to use GPRA as their objectives, do we treat 4.4 as not applicable or use GPRA standards to answer the question?**

Please see the response to question I-1.

**I-3. On the [FY24 21st CCLC Scoring Rubric](#) document, for indicator 5.4, each score references “6 W questions.” What are these?**

Indicator 5.4 includes the language “... services including (i) who will do what, (ii) when, (iii) where, (iv) to what end and (v) with what anticipated results.” The “W” questions are:

- (i) **Who** will do what?
- (ii) **When**?
- (iii) **Where**?
- (iv) To **what** end?
- (v) With **what** anticipated results?

The rubric has been updated to reflect there are five “W” questions

## Nonpublic Schools

**NPS-1. When considering outreach to nonpublic schools, can OSSE please define “nonpublic” school. Does this include private and faith-based schools near proposed locations?**

Public schools include schools operated by DCPS or any authorized public charter school in the District of Columbia. Nonpublic schools include any elementary or secondary schools that are neither operated by DCPS nor by an authorized public charter school. These schools may be called “private” schools and may be faith-based.

**NPS-2. When considering outreach to nonpublic schools, how many should be contacted?**

OSSE does not provide a minimum number of nonpublic schools that must be contacted. Please review the RFA for additional information about this outreach. If you receive notification from OSSE that your organization has been considered for a 21st CCLC award, you must provide completed and signed [Documentation of Private School Consultation Form\(s\)](#) for each nonpublic school consulted when preparing the application, if any were consulted because of their operation in the proposed service area.

**NPS-3. Please clarify what a program welcoming nonpublic school students looks like. Can it be an invitation to join a school-based program? Does funding need to be shared for programming happening on site at nonpublic schools with nonpublic schools?**

As stated in the RFA, “students who attend nonpublic schools in the area to be served by the proposed program are entitled to equitable services under the 21st CCLC program.” This means that a community learning center, even when located in a school, must be open to serving children and youth who are not enrolled in that specific school; community learning centers cannot operate for the exclusive purpose of serving one population of students. The relationship between the community learning center operator (subgrantee), a nonpublic school and students attending nonpublic schools will vary depending on the specific circumstances of the community and the students’ needs and should be determined based on the consultation between the applicant and the nonpublic school(s) in the area. However, applicants are not required to distribute award funds to nonpublic schools in the service area.

## Partnerships and Partner Attestation Forms

**P-1. On page 13 of the [FY24 Application Guidance](#) document, there are additional requirements for non-school based community learning centers, including that, for school(s) from which a majority of**



**students attend a “partner attestation form signed by a representative from the applicant organization and the LEA(s) listed as partners.” Who is the signatory? What if we cannot reach an LEA representative or school principal?**

Partner attestation forms must be signed by an authorized representative from the LEA. The authorized representative will vary depending on the LEA, and the applicant must work with the LEA(s) they plan to serve to determine who is authorized to sign the attestation form—a school principal may not be an authorized representative. Signed partner attestation forms are a requirement and must be uploaded at the time of application as a demonstration that the LEA is committed to the project, as a close working relationship is required between a non-school based community learning center operator and the LEA(s) that a majority of students attend.

**P-2. When completing the partner attestation form, who must sign off for each school partner: the LEA or the school?**

An authorized representative from the LEA must sign the partner attestation form. Each LEA will have its own internal determinations about which staff members are authorized representatives. School principals may not serve as authorized representatives.

**P-3. Can you clarify the difference between a partner attestation form coming from the LEA level, not the school level?**

When completing partner attestation forms, only an authorized representative identified by the LEA may sign the form. Each LEA will have its own internal determinations about which staff members are authorized representatives, and school principals may not serve as authorized representatives. While a deep relationship will exist between a non-LEA applicant and the school(s) they serve, the formal relationship is between the non-LEA applicant and the LEA they are working with.

**P-4. If we already have an agreement in place with an LEA because of a funding requirement with another funder, is this okay to use for 21st CCLC? Or does the agreement need to be specific to 21st CCLC?**

The partner attestation form includes information specific to 21st CCLC, including “summary of partner services to be provided,” a listing of sites/schools to be supported and time commitments from each partner to provide out-of-school time programming. Unless an existing agreement includes all the information contained on the partner attestation form, a partner attestation form must be created, signed and uploaded as part of the application. If an existing agreement satisfies the same requirements as the partner attestation form, the existing agreement may be uploaded in its place.

**P-5. Is there a list of existing school-based 21st CCLC sites? It would be helpful to know of existing DCPS schools that are already receiving 21st CCLC funding.**

OSSE does not maintain a public list of each community learning center site. OSSE does maintain a public [list of organizations](#) with current 21st CCLC subgrants. DCPS maintains a webpage about afterschool programs, including a [list of sites](#), but OSSE does not endorse the content or guarantee the accuracy of any information contained therein.

**P-6. Is a contractor considered a partner?**

A contractor may be a partner depending on the nature of the relationship. A partner, which is required to sign the partner attestation form, is more engaged than merely providing a fee-for-service type activity and instead is an integral part of the proposed program. Generally, an individual who is being paid as a contractor should not be considered a partner, but OSSE provides no guidance about when the threshold between a contractor and a partner is crossed. Applicants are encouraged to use their own judgement when making the determination about a contractor's overall contribution to the proposed project.

**P-7. Will there be any component of the application review of a proposal to verify what the application has included? I am an external evaluator and was once included in an application without being consulted in advance.**

No, OSSE will not verify that contractors have provided written or verbal agreement to participate in the proposed project. However, applicants who become subgrantees are not obligated to contract with, or pay individuals included in the initial application and may amend the application to properly adjust selected employees and vendors. Nor is any business or organization that is included in a grant application or budget without their prior consent obligated to render services to the subgrantee, even if they are included in the budget. Subgrantees should use their own organization's established processes for hiring, termination and procurement for any purchases made using 21st CCLC funds.

**P-8. If we are proposing to serve multiple sites, do we need to submit partnership attestation forms for each individual school?**

No. As stated in the [FY24 Application Guidance](#) document, an application submitted by a non-LEA application that is "proposing [to serve] multiple school sites, all operated by the same LEA, only needs to include one partner attestation form for the LEA, not one partner attestation form per site." If you are proposing to serve sites that are represented by more than one LEA, then one partner attestation form would need to be provided by each LEA.

## Budget and Carryover

### *General Budgeting Questions*

**BC-1. Can this grant be used in conjunction with any other grant funds?**

Yes. Please note that indicator 7.2 of the [FY24 21st CCLC Scoring Rubric](#) reads "Describes how federal, state and local funds will be braided for the most effective use of public resources."

**BC-2. Regarding budgeting for conference attendance, the RFA says on page 20 that "Applicants must use either their organization's established travel and per diem rates or the General Services Administration (GSA) travel resources rates. If the organizational rate is different than the GSA rate, the applicant must include the lower of the two costs." And it refers us to the application guidance which includes this sample budgeting for conference attendance: "Travel for one staff member to attend Beyond School Hours conference, including flight (\$600), hotel (\$250 per night for three nights), per diem (\$50 per day) and conference registration fees (\$600). The total for these expenditures is \$2,000." For the Beyond School Hours conference in 2024, the GSA rate for rooms is**

**\$158 (FY23 rates) but the hotel room rate for the actual 2024 conference is \$259. Are we able to budget for the actual cost of attending the conferences, or do we have to budget on the GSA rates?**

If an applicant attended a required conference during 2023, it may include actual costs when developing its budget. All other organizations must comply with the stated limits in the [request for applications](#). The [Application Guidance](#) document contains samples of the language and specificity to support writing cost justifications and the values included are examples.

**BC-3. The RFA states that the maximum funding is \$2,225 per student proposed to be served. Does a lower cost per student served have any weight on the score of the proposal? For example, will an applicant with an \$1,800 cost per student be more competitive than one at \$2,225?**

No. The only components of an application that are scored are contained within the [FY24 21st CCLC Scoring Rubric](#). The only scored component related to the cost per student is indicator 8.6, which states that “budget does not request a total award amount less than \$50,000 or greater than the product of multiplying the number of proposed students to be served by the maximum allowable amount per student (\$2,225).” A score for this will either be 0 or 1 depending on compliance.

#### *Carryover of Funds*

**BC-4. 15 percent of the grant is allowed for carryover except in year five. Why?**

The maximum length of funding for subgrantees is five years and no carryover is allowed from year five (the end of grant period) into a sixth year. This complies with [federal limitations](#) on the length of 21st CCLC grant award periods.

**BC-5. In past years, 21st CCLC was a mix of federal and local funds and there were different carryover limits depending on the funding source. Is this true during the FY24 competition?**

The FY24 competition only includes federal funds. Subgrantees may carry over up to 15 percent of their awarded funds into years two, three, four and five, but no award will be extended into a sixth year.

#### *Staffing, Salaries and Benefits*

**BC-6. In addition to the mandatory positions detailed in the RFA, can there be additional positions listed with corresponding support from the grant? For example, in our organization, the executive director and the operations and grants manager do considerable work to implement, report on and ensure fiscal health for the grant. Can these positions be supported?**

Yes, funds from this grant may be used to support salaries and benefits for staff members who are not working exclusively on the 21st CCLC program. However, the amount of time an employee works to support the 21st CCLC program and the portion of their salary and benefits paid from the grant must be comparable. For example, an employee who spends 20 percent of their time supporting the 21st CCLC program may only have up to 20 percent of their salaries and benefits budgeted in this application.

**BC-7. Can an employee’s benefits be paid from this grant and, if yes, is there a cap?**

Yes. The [21st CCLC Frequently Asked Questions](#) document states that “for full-time employees, fringe benefits may not exceed 23 percent. For part-time employees, fringe benefits may not exceed eight

percent. Annual, sick and holiday leave may be paid for under this grant award. Health benefits may also be paid for under this grant award.”

**BC-8. When preparing the budget in EGMS, do the benefits appear separate from the base salary?**

The salary and benefits for an employee may be combined into a single total amount per year. This will be included on the “Salaries and Benefits” sub-tab of the “Detailed Planning Expenditures” tab in EGMS. The breakdown of the total salaries and benefits must be included in the “Expenditure Description and Itemization” column and demonstrate that the cap on benefits has not been exceeded, if benefits are being included.

**BC-9. Please clarify staffing requirements again. If we have more than one site, must there be a project director be at each site or just site coordinators at each site supervised by a full-time project director?**

The minimum required staffing positions include one program director to oversee the entire proposed 21st CCLC program and one site coordinator per site. The application does not outline requirements about whether these roles need to be full- or part-time position, but the [21st CCLC Frequently Asked Questions](#) document does provide some guidance (not a requirement) that “as a best practice, OSSE finds that to effectively manage and administer the program, no more than one full-time employee is needed, depending on the size and scope of the program.”

**BC-10. Regarding staffing, the [21st CCLC Frequently Asked Questions](#) document states, “as a best practice, OSSE finds that to effectively manage and administer the program, no more than one full-time employee is needed, depending on the size and scope of the program.” Is this one full-time staff person per site/center?**

The number of staff members, and their status as full- or part-time employees, will depend on the size of the specific program proposed, including consideration of factors like number of sites and number of students served. In general, when considering the variety of previous subgrantees, this references one full-time staff member per program. However, this is an observation and not a limitation.

**BC-11. How should we determine the amount of salary allowed for salaries and benefits?**

You may determine the proper salary for your proposed positions. There is no guidance about how these determinations are made. However, there is a limit to the value of benefits that can be provided to employees, which is based on their salaries. Full-time employee benefits paid from the grant cannot exceed 23 percent of an employee’s salary amount, and part-time employee benefits paid from the grant cannot exceed eight percent of an employee’s salary amount. Subgrantees may pay for benefits in excess of these limits using funds from other sources.

**BC-12. Do the site coordinators need to be a full-time position, or can this be a part-time position?**

The application does not require that any position be full- or part-time.