Fiscal Year 2020 DC Community Schools Incentive Initiative – Truancy Prevention and Literacy Pilot Program: Grant Application Review for Grant Readers

Aug. 29, 2019

Agenda

I. Welcome & Introductions

II. DC Community Schools Incentive Initiative – Truancy Prevention and Literacy Pilot Program Overview

III. Request for Applications

IV. Application Review Process

V. Enterprise Grants Management System (EGMS): Walk through EGMS Test Application

VI. Quick Tips and Common Errors

VII. Q&A

DC Community Schools Incentive Initiative – Truancy Prevention and Literacy Pilot Program

Community School

A **public and private partnership** to coordinate educational, developmental, family, health, and after-school care programs during school and non-school hours for students, families, and local communities at a public school or public charter school. D.C. Official Code § 38-754.02(2).

Aim of the grant is to:

- Increase student achievement
- Improve attendance
- Increase state assessment outcomes
- Address many of the challenges faced by economically disadvantaged communities

Truancy Prevention and Literacy Pilot Program

Aim of the pilot program is to increase attendance and literacy support for students in grades kindergarten through 5. D.C. Official Code § 38-754.03(g)(3).

Request for Applications (RFA): DC Community Schools Incentive Initiative – Truancy Prevention and Literacy Pilot Program

Purpose of Funds (RFA, p. 5)

- The purpose of the DC Community Schools Incentive Initiative – Truancy Prevention and Literacy Pilot Program is to award two one-year grants.
- The overall goal of the grant is to provide resources to eligible grantees to create and enhance community-based partnerships to test whether additional resources concurrently focusing on numerous community partners dealing with literacy intervention, parental engagement, and social-emotional issues with elementary school students will significantly improve attendance and state assessment outcomes.

Allowable/Unallowable Use of Funds (RFA, p. 6)

- Grant funds may only be used for allowable grant project expenditures.
- Funds are strictly limited to developing and sustaining community schools, as described in the general subgrantee responsibilities overview section of the RFA.
- Funding may be used to cover costs of salaries and benefits of personnel, transportation for students/community members/staff to conduct grant-related activities, materials, training, and to support the promotion of community partnerships.

Allowable/Unallowable Use of Funds continued (RFA, p. 6)

- Funding may not be used for indirect cost, daily home-work travel expenses for employees and other personnel or members of the eligible consortium.

- Grant funds are subject to the terms, conditions and provisions of the Truancy Prevention and Literacy Pilot Program Emergency Amendment Act of 2019, which amends the Community Schools Incentive Act of 2012.

Priorities for Funding (RFA, p.6)

1. An elementary school with:
   i. More than 25 percent of students in grades K-5 who were chronically truant in the 2018-19 school year; and
   ii. More than 25 percent of students who scored at level 1 or level 2 on the state assessment for English language arts in the 2018-19 school year; and

Priorities for Funding continued (RFA, p.6)

2. Three or more community partners that provide at least one of the following eligible services:
    a) Programs designed to increase attendance, including reducing early chronic absenteeism rates;
    b) Programs designed to:
        i. Facilitate parental involvement in, and engagement with, their children's education, including parental activities that involve supporting, monitoring, and advocating for their children's education;
        ii. Promote parental leadership in the life of the school; and
        iii. Build parenting skills;
    c) Programs that provide a full continuum of school-based, early literacy intervention services for all grades pre-K-3, consisting of developmentally appropriate components for each grade, through a comprehensive intervention model.

General Information

Eligibility (RFA, p. 7)

- OSSE will make these grants available through a competitive process to eligible consortia, in accordance with the Truancy Prevention and Literacy Pilot Program Emergency Amendment Act of 2019, which amends the [Community Schools Incentive Act of 2012](#) D.C. Official Code § 38-754.01 et seq.

- An "eligible consortium" is a partnership established between a local education agency (LEA) in DC and one or more community partners for the purposes of establishing, operating, and sustaining a community school. [D.C. Official Code § 38-754.02(3)](#).

- An eligible consortium must demonstrate the ability to provide additional eligible services that did not exist before the establishment of the eligible consortium. [D.C. Official Code § 38-754.03](#).

Award Period (RFA, p. 7)

- The grant award period will begin on Oct. 1, 2019 and end on Sept. 30, 2020.

Funds Available (RFA, p. 6)

- The total funding available for FY20 is $600,000. An eligible consortium may apply for an award amount of $300,000.

General Subgrantee Responsibilities Overview (RFA, p. 10-12)

An eligible consortium must demonstrate its ability to provide "eligible services" that were not previously provided to the student/community population by the consortium and establish, operate, and sustain a community school. Pursuant to the Community Schools Incentive Act of 2012, as amended, "eligible services" include:

(A) Primary medical/dental care that will be available to students and community residents;

(B) Mental health prevention and treatment services that will be available to students and community residents;

(C) Academic-enrichment activities designed to promote a student's cognitive development and provide opportunities to practice and apply academic skills;

(D) Programs designed to increase attendance, including reducing early chronic absenteeism rates;

(E) Youth development programs designed to promote young people's social, emotional, physical, and moral development, including arts, sports, physical fitness, youth leadership, community service, and service learning opportunities;

(F) Early childhood education, including Head Start and Early Head Start programs;

General Subgrantee Responsibilities Overview continued (RFA, p. 10)

(G) Programs designed to:

- (i) Facilitate parental involvement in, and engagement with, their children's education, including parental activities that involve supporting, monitoring, and advocating for their children's education;

- (ii) Promote parental leadership in the life of the school, and

- (iii) Build parenting skills;

(H) School-age child-care services, including before-school and after-school services and full-day programming that operates during school holidays, summers, vacations, and weekends;

(I) Programs that provide assistance to students who have been truant, suspended, or expelled and that offer multiple pathways to high school graduation or General Educational Development completion;

(J) Youth and adult job-training services and career-counseling services;

(K) Nutrition-education services;

(L) Adult education, including instruction in English as a second language, adult literacy, computer literacy, financial literacy, and hard-skills training;

General Subgrantee Responsibilities Overview continued (RFA, p. 10-11)

(M) Programs that provide remedial education and enrichment activities; or

(N) Programs that provide a full continuum of school-based, early literacy intervention services for all grades pre-K through 3, consisting of developmentally appropriate components for each grade, through a comprehensive model.

Additionally, applicants must demonstrate an ability to establish and sustain the following components:

- **Community Partnerships.** Eligible consortia must establish a partnership between at least one LEA in DC and one community-based organization (CBO) for the purposes of establishing, operating, and sustaining a community school. The consortium will establish additional community partnerships to address literacy intervention, parental engagement, and social-emotional issues with elementary school students of the LEA to significantly improve attendance and state assessment outcomes. The consortia will designate the LEA or the CBO as the lead partner.

General Grantee Responsibilities

General Grantee Responsibilities Overview continued (RFA, p. 11-12)

- **Community School Coordinator.** Eligible consortia must designate a paid Community School Coordinator to facilitate effective implementation and maintenance of the community school including providing ongoing vision for the community school, securing and maintaining the community partnership, integrating "eligible services" into the school community and assuring that students are participating in these services, managing the budget, seeking additional funding sources, among other things. The Community School Coordinator, if not a full-time employee of a member of the "eligible consortia," must have adequate time devoted to the community school project to fulfill the requirements stated above.

- **Community School Advisory Board**. Eligible consortia must develop a community school advisory board and include members of the school leadership, school faculty, parents of school students, community leaders, community-based organizations and other community members. The board must convene, at minimum, four times per year.

Grant Objectives

- Increase attendance and literacy supports for students in grades kindergarten through 5
- Improve state assessment outcomes

Program Specific Assurances

- We will ensure that the facilities under our school or organization's ownership, lease or supervision, which shall be utilized in the accomplishment of the project are compliant with all District statutes, codes, and regulations;

- If required by *The Healthy Schools Act of 2010* (HAS) (D.C. Law 18-209), our school or organization is in compliance of all of the requirements of this act;

- We know and understand that awarded funds shall be used to support community-based education and activities which may include covering the costs salaries and benefits of personnel, transportation for students/community members, materials, training, and to support the promotion of community partnerships. Funding may not be used for travel expenses for employees and other personnel of members of the "eligible consortium." The funds may not be transferred outside of, or within the organization or school, for any unrelated purpose; and

- We will establish safeguards to prohibit employees from using their positions for a purpose that is or gives the appearance of being motivated by a desire for private gain for themselves or others, particularly with whom they have family, business, or other ties.

Application Review Process

Application Review Timeline: Overview

Application Deadline
- Applications are due no later Sept. 16, 2019 (3 p.m.)
- Must be submitted through EGMS
- Late applications will not be accepted

Application Review Period
- Applicants scored by external reviewers in EGMS, Sept. 23-Oct. 4, 2019

Award Announcement
- Currently, we hope to award the grantees on Oct. 11, 2019, but this timeline is subject to change.

Review Panel

Review Panel (RFA, p. 18)

- OSSE is using external peer reviewers to review and score the applications received for this RFA.

- External peer reviewers may include employees of the District of Columbia government who are not employed by OSSE.

- External peer reviewers are experts in the field or the subject matter.

- An objective rubric will be used by reviewers for scoring each application.

- The final decision rests solely with OSSE.

- After reviewing the recommendations of the review panel and any other information considered relevant, OSSE shall decide which applicants to fund.

Review Panel

Expectations of Reviewers

- Draw upon their expertise in evaluating the applications.

- Maintain the confidentiality of the process and information reviewed.

- Let us know ahead of time if issues or conflicts arise.

- Adhere to all deadlines.

- Read independently, score and evaluate applications based on an assessment of the extent to which each application meets the criteria as described in the scoring rubric.

- Make an objective assessment of applications assigned and provide an accurate evaluation of each application reviewed.

- Always be mindful that their scores and comments will determine which applications will be recommended for funding.

- Review conflict of interest policies and be fully aware of confidential nature of applications and aspects of grant review process.

Review Panel

Readers are required to:

- Read all applications in their entirety.

- Follow all instructions provided.

- Review and consider only the information in the applications. Reviewers are not required to access external documents or websites.

- Provide a numerical score for each criterion.

- Provide constructive written comments that provide meaningful information to the applicant, including suggestions for improvements.

- Adequately address the strengths and weaknesses for each criterion in every application based on the selection criteria.

- Provide summaries of strengths and weaknesses that (1) justify the score awarded for the section and (2) are consistent with each criterion being rated. Statements of strengths and weaknesses must be written in complete grammatically correct sentences.

- Treat all applications in a fair and equitable manner.

Scores/Comments Alignment

- The numerical scores to an applicant's response to the criteria must be consistent with your written comments. Comments and scores should reflect the same overall assessment.

- Scores should be checked for accuracy to ensure that the appropriate point scale was used.

- Credit points may be awarded in whole numbers only.

- Comments should both praise strong areas as well as critique weak ones. *Comments are most helpful when they provide specific feedback on why something was strong or weak rather than simply describe or reiterate what the applicant stated*. Remarks not only should tie directly to the resulting score, but also give an applicant vital feedback for writing future applications.

- Comments should indicate whether the applicant's response to the selection criteria is incomplete, poor, average, good, or excellent.

- Comments MUST be based on the scoring criteria in the rubric

- Strength(s) must be aligned with criterion or criteria for which full points have been given. Weaknesses must be aligned with criterion or criteria for which only partial or no evidence has been found.

Characteristics of High-Quality Comments

- Are objective/neutral/unbiased.

- Specify exactly which elements of a given criterion the applicant met or did not meet. The difference is clear between comments based on fact and those based on professional judgment.

- Consistent within each criterion, rooted directly in the rubric.

- Specify exactly which elements of a given criterion the applicant met or did not meet.

- Analytical rather than descriptive.

- Detailed and written in complete sentences.

- Limited to information provided in the application and do not imply information that is not included in the application.

- Constructive, courteous, professional, and clearly understandable. Remarks not only should tie directly to the resulting score, but also give an applicant vital feedback for writing future applications.

Review Panel

Characteristics of Low Quality Comments

- Provide too little documentation (such as writing only "yes" or" good").

- Repeat the selection criterion rather than provide an analytical assessment.

- Focused on applicants' grammar and spelling, rather than content.

- Not clearly related to the selection criteria.

- Inconsistent with assigned scores or recommendations.

- Inaccurate based on the information provided in the application.

- Misspelled or have grammatical errors.

- Contain judgments that are outside the scope of the responsibility of the reviewer.

- Would be inappropriate to share with applicants / external audiences.

Examples of Acceptable Reviewer Comments

Executive Summary:

Strengths
The applicant provides an overview of the proposed program, which includes the schools to be served, the reasons for selecting the target population, the program's key design elements, and describes why the proposed strategies are the best practices and strategies for effectively addressing the needs of the target population to achieve desired outcomes.

Weaknesses
The applicant did not identify its partners and explain their capacity to effectively support the 21st CCLC program.

Examples of Acceptable Reviewer Comments

Needs Assessment:

Strengths
The applicant provided a an overview of the proposed program, which includes a brief, but thorough description of the need, data sources used to perform the needs assessment, the number of homeless students served, and the method used to gather data to identify barriers that affect homeless children and youth.

Weaknesses
The applicant did include the method used to identify the need and/or barriers that affect homeless children and youth.

Examples of Acceptable Reviewer Comments

Detailed Planning Budget Expenditures:

Strengths
The budget is consistent with program priorities and will support the effective implementation of the proposed MKV program. The amount requested seems adequate for the proposed program design. The expenses appear to be necessary to achieve the objectives of the proposed MKV program. Finally, all associated costs are reasonable and align to the goals and objectives of the program.

Weaknesses
It is not clear how much funds will be used to support transportation and professional development opportunities for staff.

Examples of Sentence Starters for Comments

Strengths

- The applicant describes a clear program design that addresses the identified priorities in an effective way as evidenced by…
- The proposed three-year plan strategy is feasible because…
- The proposed plan for how the applicant will engage more students in the 21st CCLC program is adequate because…
- The identified community needs are included in the… and have been substantiated by community members' statements, official reports, and statistics in an adequate way as evidenced by…
- The applicant will strengthen partnerships with community organizations to increase support for community-problem solving as evidenced by…
- The applicant explains how the program will increase the capacity of program staff to provide service to children and family to…

Examples of Sentence Starters for Comments continued

Weaknesses

- The impact the proposed program will have on students is weak because…
- The applicant does not describe a clear program design that addresses the identified program priorities in an effective way as evidenced by…
- Although the applicant provided a general timeline of the program's major goals and activities, it was not clear how the proposed program would implement training and technical assistance activities or provide student leadership opportunities because…
- The proposed strategy and associated activities do not adequately address the identified community needs as outlined by the applicant, because…
- The absence of relevant information on… makes it difficult to assess the impact of the program as described by the applicant …
- The program design elements are not aligned with program objectives because…

Review Panel

Point Values

Score Not Assignable	Limited/ Weak	Fair	Good	Strong/ Exceptional
No response or information/ information doesn't answer prompt question	Attempts to answer prompt	Mostly answers prompt	Fully answers prompt	Answers prompt in depth; reviewer has no questions
Information, if provided, is unclear or hard to understand	Missing a lot of requested information/ unclear	Missing some of requested information/ mostly clear	All requested information provided/ clear	All requested information provided/ clear, highly focused, coherently integrated answers
Inappropriate answer	Appropriate answer with limited details	Appropriate answer with details; answer is not well expressed	Appropriate answer with details; answer is well expressed	Appropriate, well-articulated answer that is extremely detailed and shows a clear and relevant path to success
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree

Scoring Rubric

A. **Section A- Program Features: Total 30 points** (RFA, p. 40-41)
- Grant Requirements (15 points)
- Program Mission and Vision (5 points)
- Program Goals (5 points)
- Program Start-Up (5 points)

B. **Section B- Program Implementation and Monitoring: Total 30 points** (RFA, p. 42-43)
- Parent/Student Involvement (8 points)
- Community Engagement (8 points)
- Data Collection (7 points)
- Evaluation of Program (7 points)

C. **Section C- Financial Management and Sustainability: Total 30 points** (RFA, p. 44-45)
- Financial Management (11 points)
- Program Budget (11 points)
- Program Sustainability (8 points)

Scoring Rubric

Scoring Rubric continued

Priority Areas: Total 10 points (RFA, p. 45)
- Question 1 (4 points)
- Question 2 (4 points)
- Question 3 (2 points)

Total Points for Section A (out of 30 points)	
Total Points for Section B (out of 30 points)	
Total Points for Section C (out of 30 points)	
Priority areas points (out of 10 points)	
GRAND Total (out of 100 points)	

Attachments

Attachments

- **RFA Attachment A:** Administrative Approval Form (RFA, p. 28)
- **RFA Attachment B:** Proposed Grant Budget (RFA, p. 29)
- **RFA Attachment C:** Attestation of Priority Areas (RFA, p. 30)
- **RFA Attachment D:** Central Data Assurances (RFA, p. 32-39)
- **RFA Attachment E:** Scoring Rubric (RFA, p. 40-46)

Attachments

Other Attachments (required uploads in EGMS) (RFA, p. 27)

- **Attachment 1:** Position descriptions for any new staff to be hired with grant funds and a resume if a candidate has already been hired
- **Attachment 2:** A timeline of implementation and programmatic activities
- **Attachment 3:** An evaluation plan for quarterly qualitative quantitative program evaluation and to assess the outcomes of the community school in terms of services provided and improvement in health, academic or social outcomes.
- **Attachment 4:** W-9
- **Attachment 5:** Certificate of Good Standing
- **Attachment 6:** Clean Hands
- **Attachment 7:** Financial Sustainability Plan
- **Attachment 8:** Letters of Supports for Community Partners

Enterprise Grants Management System (EGMS)

- If the Grant Point of Contact does not already have this information, provide the following to the Grant Point of Contact:
  - First Name
  - Last Name
  - Email Address
  - Note if you have worked in EGMS previously and provide a new email address for your reader role
- Look for an email with the URL, username and password. The system may require you to set a new password.

- Conflict of interest: "**personal or vested interest in the organizations that submitted applications**" – DC Citywide Grants Manual and Sourcebook, Sec. 8.1(b)

- Reviewers all complete a Conflict of Interest form first, signing that they would let OSSE know if they learn of a conflict with a particular applicant.

EGMS

Applicant: 000-0120 Friendship PCS

Application: 2017-2018 Access to QCC Expansion - 00
Cycle: Original Application

Review Checklist: Competitive Grant Reader
Printer-Friendly
Close Browser

| OVERVIEW | EXECUTIVE SUMMARY | INFORMATION ABOUT THE ORGANIZATION | ORGANIZATIONAL KNOWLEDGE | PROCESS TO PROVIDE AND MONITOR SUB-GRANTS | DETAILED PLANNED EXPENDITURES | SCORING SUMMARY |

Overview

The purpose and content of each section is described below. Applicants should include all information necessary to adequately describe the proposed project. The scoring of the application is based on a 100-point scale. These criteria allow the external peer reviewers and OSSE staff to determine an applicant's justification of need for grant funds, the soundness of its proposed service delivery plan, the adequacy and reasonableness of proposed resources needed, and demonstrated capability for managing the proposed program.

| OVERVIEW | CONTACT INFORMATION | FUNDING DISTRIBUTION | PROGRAM INFORMATION | DETAILED PLANNED EXPENDITURES | ASSURANCES | SUBMIT | APPLICATION HISTORY | APPLICATION PRINT |

| CLASSIFICATION | EXECUTIVE SUMMARY | INFORMATION ABOUT THE ORGANIZATION | ORGANIZATIONAL KNOWLEDGE | PROCESS TO PROVIDE AND MONITOR SUB-GRANTS | WORK PLAN | EVALUATION AND DATA COLLECTION PLAN | STAFFING PLAN | OTHER ATTACHMENTS |

Executive Summary

Briefly describe the applicant organization and its proposed methodology for providing technical assistance, designing an appropriate sub-granting mechanism to expand access to quality early childhood services, and administering the grant fund in a manner that will directly result in the creation and expansion of 1,000 quality child care slots in DC.

(33 of 5000 maximum characters used)

We will do the project very well.

41

EGMS

ACCESS TO QUALITY CHILD CARE EXPANSION GRANT - Scoring Summary

Section	Available Points	Points Awarded
Information about the Organization	**10 Points**	9
-Mission and History	5 Points	5
-Strategic Logic	5 points	4
Organizational Knowledge	**35 Points**	27
-Experience in Expanding Access to Quality Child Care through Grant-making and Provision of Technical Assistance	10 points	10
-Organizational Expertise in Financing and Investment in Early Childhood Development	10 points	9
-Plan to Leverage Best Practices in Expanding Access to Quality Child Care	10 points	6
-Organizational Networks:	5 points	2
Process to Provide and Monitor Sub-Grants	**45 Points**	30
-Communication Strategy	10 points	7
-Cost Estimation	10 points	6
-Sub-Grant Competition	15 points	10
-Monitoring Sub-Grants and Providing Technical Assistance to Sub-Grantees	10 points	7
Detailed Planned Expenditures: Financial Management and Proposed Budget	**10 Points**	5
-Financial Management	5 points	3
-Proposed Budget	5 points	2
Application Total Points:	**100 Points**	

Overall Comments:

CALCULATE TOTALS   SAVE PAGE

43

Applicant: 000-0120 Friendship PCS

Review Checklist: Competitive Grant Reader

Printer-Friendly

Application: 2017-2018 Access to QCC Expansion - 00

Close Browser

Cycle: Original Application

Applicant: 000-0120 Friendship PCS

Access to Quality Child Care Expansion ▾

Printer-Friendly

Application: 2017-2018 Access to QCC Expansion - 00

Click to Return to Reader To Do List

Cycle: Original Application

Click to Return to GMS Access/Select Page

Click to Return to Menu List / Sign Out

Application: Access to QCC Expansion ▼

Reader To Do List Click for Instructions

Reader: Reader 1 OCIO

Before you can review an application, you must indicate whether or not you have any conflict of interest with the applicant. Select either 'Yes' or "No" and press the 'Save Conflict Answers' button.

SAVE CONFLICT ANSWERS   REVIEW APPLICATION   SUBMIT

Conflict of Interest Yes No		Select	Applicant	Total Score	Review Status
○	◉	○	Booker T. Washington PCS	99	Completed
○	◉	◉	Friendship PCS	71	Review Started

Application: Access to QCC Expansion ▼

Reader To Do List Click for Instructions

Reader: Reader 1 OCIO

Before you can review an application, you must indicate whether or not you have any conflict of interest with the applicant. Select either 'Yes' or "No" and press the 'Save Conflict Answers' button.

SAVE CONFLICT ANSWERS   SUBMIT

Conflict of Interest Yes No		Select	Applicant	Total Score	Review Status
○	◉	○	Booker T. Washington PCS	99	Completed
○	◉	○	Friendship PCS	71	Completed

45

Walk-through: EGMS Test Application

Quick Tips and Common Errors

Quick Tips

- Hit "Save/Calculate" when Scores are entered or edited on the Reader Scoresheet.

- On the Scoring Summary tab of the Reader Scoresheet, click "Calculate Totals" and "Save Page."

- Ensure no boxes are blank under "Points Awarded" on the Scoring Summary tab of the Reader Scoresheet.

- On the Scoring Summary tab of the Reader Scoresheet, do not exceed maximum possible "Available Points."

- Ensure Total Score has been recorded in the indicated space on Reader To Do List before clicking "Submit."

Common Errors for Readers

Potential Error 1: Scores are entered, "Save/Calculate" is clicked. Scores are then edited and "Save/Calculate" is not clicked. The revised score will not be updated.

To resolve Error 1: Click "Save/Calculate" after entering or editing any scores. Confirm that the sub-total for the section is the sum of the scores given to the sub-sections.

Note: "Save/Calculate" is one button on all tabs on the Reader Scoresheet, excluding the Scoring Summary.

Potential Error 2: A score higher than the maximum allowed for a sub-section will still calculate into the total for the section (i.e., 6 out of 5 for "Mission and History").

To resolve Error 2: Correct the score to be a number less than or equal to the maximum allowed and re-click "Save/Calculate." Confirm that the sub-total for the section is the sum of the scores given to the sub-sections.

Potential Error 3: Only "Calculate Totals" is clicked and scores are not saved.

ACCESS TO QUALITY CHILD CARE EXPANSION GRANT - Scoring Summary

Section	Available Points	Points Awarded
Information about the Organization	10 Points	9
-Mission and History	5 Points	5
-Strategic Logic	5 points	4
Organizational Knowledge	35 Points	27
-Experience in Expanding Access to Quality Child Care through Grant-making and Provision of Technical Assistance	10 points	10
-Organizational Expertise in Financing and Investment in Early Childhood Development	10 points	9
-Plan to Leverage Best Practices in Expanding Access to Quality Child Care	10 points	6
-Organizational Networks:	5 points	2
Process to Provide and Monitor Sub-Grants	45 Points	30
-Communication Strategy	10 points	7
-Cost Estimation	10 points	6
-Sub-Grant Competition	15 points	10
-Monitoring Sub-Grants and Providing Technical Assistance to Sub-Grantees	10 points	7
Detailed Planned Expenditures: Financial Management and Proposed Budget	10 Points	5
-Financial Management	5 points	3
-Proposed Budget	5 points	2
Application Total Points:	100 Points	

Overall Comments:

Overall Comments:

CALCULATE TOTALS   **SAVE PAGE**

To resolve Error 3: Click "Calculate Totals" and "Save Page" to ensure the score is saved and recorded.

Potential Error 4: Only "Calculate Totals" is clicked. The score and any comments entered in "Overall Comments" are not recorded.

ACCESS TO QUALITY CHILD CARE EXPANSION GRANT - Scoring Summary

Section	Available Points	Points Awarded
Information about the Organization	**10 Points**	9
-Mission and History	5 Points	5
-Strategic Logic	5 points	4
Organizational Knowledge	**35 Points**	27
-Experience in Expanding Access to Quality Child Care through Grant-making and Provision of Technical Assistance	10 points	10
-Organizational Expertise in Financing and Investment in Early Childhood Development	10 points	9
-Plan to Leverage Best Practices in Expanding Access to Quality Child Care	10 points	6
-Organizational Networks:	5 points	2
Process to Provide and Monitor Sub-Grants	**45 Points**	30
-Communication Strategy	10 points	7
-Cost Estimation	10 points	6
-Sub-Grant Competition	15 points	10
-Monitoring Sub-Grants and Providing Technical Assistance to Sub-Grantees	10 points	7
Detailed Planned Expenditures: Financial Management and Proposed Budget	**10 Points**	5
-Financial Management	5 points	3
-Proposed Budget	5 points	2
Application Total Points:	**100 Points**	

To resolve Error 4: Click "Calculate Totals" and "Save Page" on the Scoring Summary tab of the Reader Scoresheet. "Calculate Totals" will place the sum of the "Points Awarded" in the "Application Total Points" box. Clicking "Save Page" will save and record the score and comments.

Note: "Overall Comments" is a good space to indicate any comments on the application as a whole, the Work Plan, the Evaluation and Data Collection Plan or the Staffing Plan sections of the application.

Potential Error 5: Sub-totals are blank, artificially reducing total score.

ACCESS TO QUALITY CHILD CARE EXPANSION GRANT - Scoring Summary

Section	Available Points	Points Awarded
Information about the Organization	10 Points	9
-Mission and History	5 Points	5
-Strategic Logic	5 points	4
Organizational Knowledge	35 Points	27
-Experience in Expanding Access to Quality Child Care through Grant-making and Provision of Technical Assistance	10 points	10
-Organizational Expertise in Financing and Investment in Early Childhood Development	10 points	9
-Plan to Leverage Best Practices in Expanding Access to Quality Child Care	10 points	6
-Organizational Networks:	5 points	2
Process to Provide and Monitor Sub-Grants	45 Points	30
-Communication Strategy	10 points	7
-Cost Estimation	10 points	6
-Sub-Grant Competition	15 points	10
-Monitoring Sub-Grants and Providing Technical Assistance to Sub-Grantees	10 points	7
Detailed Planned Expenditures: Financial Management and Proposed Budget	10 Points	5
-Financial Management	5 points	3
-Proposed Budget	5 points	2
Application Total Points:	100 Points	

To resolve Error 5: If boxes are blank, return to related tab corresponding to the blank score, hit "Save/Calculate" again and then return to the Scoring Summary page to confirm the issue has been resolved and all boxes now have scores that are: (a) less than or equal to the maximum score allowed for the section, and (b) match your overall views on the section. Confirm also that the total score matches your view on the application (See Error 4).

Potential Error 6: Scores are higher/lower than intended.

ACCESS TO QUALITY CHILD CARE EXPANSION GRANT - Scoring Summary

Section	Available Points	Points Awarded
Information about the Organization	**10 Points**	9
-Mission and History	5 Points	5
-Strategic Logic	5 points	4
Organizational Knowledge	**35 Points**	27
-Experience in Expanding Access to Quality Child Care through Grant-making and Provision of Technical Assistance	10 points	10
-Organizational Expertise in Financing and Investment in Early Childhood Development	10 points	9
-Plan to Leverage Best Practices in Expanding Access to Quality Child Care	10 points	6
-Organizational Networks:	5 points	2
Process to Provide and Monitor Sub-Grants	**45 Points**	30
-Communication Strategy	10 points	7
-Cost Estimation	10 points	6
-Sub-Grant Competition	15 points	10
-Monitoring Sub-Grants and Providing Technical Assistance to Sub-Grantees	10 points	7
Detailed Planned Expenditures: Financial Management and Proposed Budget	**10 Points**	5
-Financial Management	5 points	3
-Proposed Budget	5 points	2
Application Total Points:	**100 Points**	

Overall Comments:

To resolve Error 6: If the total score (e.g., 83 out of 100) does not reflect your view on the application overall, re-visit the other tabs, re-score and hit "Save/Calculate" again. Return to "Scoring Summary" and hit "Calculate Totals" and "Save Page."

Common Errors for Readers

Potential Error 7: Blank score is submitted to OSSE.

To resolve Error 7: If "Total Score" is blank on the Reader To-Do List, hit "Review Application" to return to the Scoring Summary tab of the Review Checklist and click "Calculate Totals" and "Save Page" again. Navigate back to the Reader To-Do List by clicking "Close Browser" on the Reader To-Do List and "Return to Reader To-Do List" on the Application window. The "Total Score" should now appear on the Reader To-Do List. Once the score is there, and it matches your overall view on the application (See Error 4), click "Submit." The "Review Status" will then change to "Completed."

Common Errors for Readers

Final Quick Tips:

- **When in doubt, contact the EGMS help center**. (Note: A record of contact with EGMS will not excuse missing the review submission deadline.)

- **Save early and often** – EGMS times out and kicks users out of the system after 60 minutes of inactivity.

- **Narrative responses may not exceed the stated word count**. If you cut and paste from a Word document, double-check that final sentences/paragraphs are not cut off.

- **EGMS does not handle special characters well**. Contact the EGMS help center if you think you are encountering this problem.

- **EGMS Help:** osse.callcenter@dc.gov (202) 719-6500

Next Steps

Next Steps: Overview

- Reviewers will confirm the appropriate email address for their role.

- Reviewers who complete the required webinar will receive credentials to log into EGMS.

- Reviewers will test credentials ahead of grant assignments to ensure they are functioning.

- Each satisfactory application will be assigned to three reviewers.

- Reviewers will review, provide scores on the rubric, and submit comments within EGMS.

- All scores are due to OSSE by Oct. 4, 2019 at 3 p.m.

- OSSE will review scores. If a wide variance exists, reviewers will be **required to participate** in a consensus meeting between Oct. 7, 2019 and Oct. 9, 2019.

- OSSE will select awardees based on reviewer scores and comments, which may be shared with applicants (without reviewer names).

Next Steps: Awarding the Grant

Sept. 16
- Applications submitted in EGMS

Sept. 17-20
- Applications reviewed by OSSE Reviewer 1
- Applications released to Readers

Sept. 23-Oct. 4 & Oct. 7-9
- Applications reviewed and scored by Readers
- All technical issues addressed

Oct. 9-10
- Applications reviewed by OSSE Reviewer 2

Oct. 11
- Grant Award Notifications Issued

- Please review the webinar for the Healthy Tots grant. This is an excellent resource that walks readers through the step-by-step process of how to conduct a review.

- https://osse.dc.gov/node/1304511

FIND US

ADDRESS:

1050 First St. NE,

Washington, DC 20002

POC:

Melissa Harper-Butler, Program Analyst
Division of Systems and Supports, K-12
Office of the State Superintendent of Education
Phone: (202) 478-2409

Melissa.Harper-Butler@dc.gov

Yuliana Del Arroyo, Director of Special Programs
Division of Systems and Supports, K-12
Office of the State Superintendent of Education
Phone: (202) 741-0478
Yuliana.Delarroyo@dc.gov

GET SOCIAL

facebook.com/ossedc

twitter.com/ossedc

youtube.com/DCEducation

www.osse.dc.gov