

State of Maine
Master Score Sheet

RFP# 202312249					
21 st Century Community Learning Centers Program					
Bidder Name:		RSU 54/MSAD 54	RSU 24	Franklin County Children's Task Force (RSU 73)	Franklin County Children's Task Force (RSU 58)
Proposed Cost:		\$295,000.00	\$182,000.00	\$300,000.00	\$258,252.00
Scoring Sections	Points Available				
Section I: Preliminary Information	Pass/Fail	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
Section II: Specifications of Work	55	53	55	49	49
Section III: Budget Proposal	38	36	35	36	34
Section IV: Priority Points	7	6	1	5	2
TOTAL	<u>100</u>	<u>95</u>	<u>91</u>	<u>90</u>	<u>85</u>
Bidder Name:		LearningWorks (Biddeford)	LearningWorks (RSU 57)	LearningWorks (Portland) (EER)	LearningWorks (Portland) (OAP)
Proposed Cost:		\$202,333.52	\$149,606.00	\$162,000.00	\$162,000.00
Scoring Sections	Points Available				
Section I: Preliminary Information	Pass/Fail	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
Section II: Specifications of Work	55	49	52	47	47
Section III: Budget Proposal	38	33	30	32	33
Section IV: Priority Points	7	3	1	4	2
TOTAL	<u>100</u>	<u>85</u>	<u>83</u>	<u>83</u>	<u>82</u>

Bidder Name:		Boys & Girls Club Kennebec Valley	RSU 17/MSAD 17 (West Paris)	Westbrook Public Schools	RSU 85/MSAD 19
Proposed Cost:		\$325,000.00	\$100,000.00	\$175,000.00	\$100,000.00
Scoring Sections	Points Available				
Section I: Preliminary Information	Pass/Fail	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
Section II: Specifications of Work	55	46	46	44	41
Section III: Budget Proposal	38	34	31	32	34
Section IV: Priority Points	7	1	3	4	3
TOTAL	<u>100</u>	<u>81</u>	<u>80</u>	<u>80</u>	<u>78</u>
Bidder Name:		RSU 17/MSAD 17 (Bryant Pond)	RSU 67		
Proposed Cost:		\$150,000.00	\$250,000.00		
Scoring Sections	Points Available				
Section I: Preliminary Information	Pass/Fail	Pass	Pass		
Section II: Specifications of Work	55	40	32		
Section III: Budget Proposal	38	23	22		
Section IV: Priority Points	7	2	2		
TOTAL	<u>100</u>	<u>65</u>	<u>56</u>		



**STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**

**Janet T. Mills
Governor**

**Pender Makin
Commissioner**

June 3, 2024

Ms. Holly Jordan
Boys & Girls Club of Kennebec Valley
14 Pray Street
Gardiner, ME 04345

SUBJECT: Notice of Conditional Contract Award(s) under RFP # 202312249,
21st Century Community Learning Centers Program

Dear Ms. Jordan:

This letter is in regard to the subject Request for Proposals (RFP), issued by the State of Maine Department of Education for the 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program. The Department has evaluated the proposals received using the evaluation criteria identified in the RFP, and the Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award(s) to the following bidder(s):

- Boys & Girls Club of Kennebec Valley
- Franklin County Children's Task Force (RSU 58)
- Franklin County Children's Task Force (RSU 73)
- LearningWorks (Biddeford)
- LearningWorks (Portland) (EE&R)
- LearningWorks (Portland) (OA&P)
- LearningWorks (RSU 57)
- RSU 17/MSAD 17 (West Paris)
- RSU 24
- RSU 54/MSAD 54
- RSU 85/MSAD 19
- Westbrook Public Schools

The bidder(s) listed above received the evaluation team's highest ranking(s). The Department will be contacting the aforementioned bidder(s) soon to negotiate a contract. As provided in the RFP, the Notice of Conditional Contract Award is subject to execution of a written contract and, as a result, this Notice does NOT constitute the formation of a contract between the Department and the apparent successful vendor. The vendor shall not acquire any legal or equitable rights relative to the contract services until a contract containing terms and conditions acceptable to the Department is executed. The Department further reserves the right to cancel this Notice of Conditional Contract Award at any time prior to the execution of a written contract.

As stated in the RFP, following announcement of this award decision, all submissions in response to the RFP are considered public records available for public inspection pursuant to the State of Maine Freedom of Access Act (FOAA). 1 M.R.S. §§ 401 et seq.; 5 M.R.S. § 1825-B (6).

This award decision is conditioned upon final approval by the State Procurement Review Committee and the successful negotiation of a contract. A Statement of Appeal Rights has been provided with this letter; see below.

Thank you for your interest in doing business with the State of Maine.

Sincerely,

Travis W. Doughty,
21st CCLC State Coordinator
Maine Department of Education

STATEMENT OF APPEAL RIGHTS

Any person aggrieved by an award decision may request an appeal hearing. The request must be made to the Director of the Bureau of General Services, in writing, within 15 days of notification of the contract award as provided in 5 M.R.S. § 1825-E (2) and the Rules of the Department of Administrative and Financial Services, Bureau of General Services, Division of Purchases, Chapter 120, § (2) (2).



**STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**

**Janet T. Mills
Governor**

**Pender Makin
Commissioner**

June 3, 2024

Ms. Renee Whitley
Franklin County Children's Task Force
113 Church Street
Farmington, ME 04938

SUBJECT: Notice of Conditional Contract Award(s) under RFP # 202312249,
21st Century Community Learning Centers Program

Dear Ms. Whitley:

This letter is in regard to the subject Request for Proposals (RFP), issued by the State of Maine Department of Education for the 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program. The Department has evaluated the proposals received using the evaluation criteria identified in the RFP, and the Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award(s) to the following bidder(s):

- Boys & Girls Club of Kennebec Valley
- Franklin County Children's Task Force (RSU 58)
- Franklin County Children's Task Force (RSU 73)
- LearningWorks (Biddeford)
- LearningWorks (Portland) (EE&R)
- LearningWorks (Portland) (OA&P)
- LearningWorks (RSU 57)
- RSU 17/MSAD 17 (West Paris)
- RSU 24
- RSU 54/MSAD 54
- RSU 85/MSAD 19
- Westbrook Public Schools

The bidder(s) listed above received the evaluation team's highest ranking(s). The Department will be contacting the aforementioned bidder(s) soon to negotiate a contract. As provided in the RFP, the Notice of Conditional Contract Award is subject to execution of a written contract and, as a result, this Notice does NOT constitute the formation of a contract between the Department and the apparent successful vendor. The vendor shall not acquire any legal or equitable rights relative to the contract services until a contract containing terms and conditions acceptable to the Department is executed. The Department further reserves the right to cancel this Notice of Conditional Contract Award at any time prior to the execution of a written contract.

As stated in the RFP, following announcement of this award decision, all submissions in response to the RFP are considered public records available for public inspection pursuant to the State of Maine Freedom of Access Act (FOAA). 1 M.R.S. §§ 401 et seq.; 5 M.R.S. § 1825-B (6).

This award decision is conditioned upon final approval by the State Procurement Review Committee and the successful negotiation of a contract. A Statement of Appeal Rights has been provided with this letter; see below.

Thank you for your interest in doing business with the State of Maine.

Sincerely,

Travis W. Doughty,
21st CCLC State Coordinator
Maine Department of Education

STATEMENT OF APPEAL RIGHTS

Any person aggrieved by an award decision may request an appeal hearing. The request must be made to the Director of the Bureau of General Services, in writing, within 15 days of notification of the contract award as provided in 5 M.R.S. § 1825-E (2) and the Rules of the Department of Administrative and Financial Services, Bureau of General Services, Division of Purchases, Chapter 120, § (2) (2).



**STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**

**Janet T. Mills
Governor**

**Pender Makin
Commissioner**

June 3, 2024

Ms. Milissa Cousins
Franklin County Children's Task Force
113 Church Street
Farmington, ME 04938

SUBJECT: Notice of Conditional Contract Award(s) under RFP # 202312249,
21st Century Community Learning Centers Program

Dear Ms. Cousins:

This letter is in regard to the subject Request for Proposals (RFP), issued by the State of Maine Department of Education for the 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program. The Department has evaluated the proposals received using the evaluation criteria identified in the RFP, and the Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award(s) to the following bidder(s):

- Boys & Girls Club of Kennebec Valley
- Franklin County Children's Task Force (RSU 58)
- Franklin County Children's Task Force (RSU 73)
- LearningWorks (Biddeford)
- LearningWorks (Portland) (EE&R)
- LearningWorks (Portland) (OA&P)
- LearningWorks (RSU 57)
- RSU 17/MSAD 17 (West Paris)
- RSU 24
- RSU 54/MSAD 54
- RSU 85/MSAD 19
- Westbrook Public Schools

The bidder(s) listed above received the evaluation team's highest ranking(s). The Department will be contacting the aforementioned bidder(s) soon to negotiate a contract. As provided in the RFP, the Notice of Conditional Contract Award is subject to execution of a written contract and, as a result, this Notice does NOT constitute the formation of a contract between the Department and the apparent successful vendor. The vendor shall not acquire any legal or equitable rights relative to the contract services until a contract containing terms and conditions acceptable to the Department is executed. The Department further reserves the right to cancel this Notice of Conditional Contract Award at any time prior to the execution of a written contract.

As stated in the RFP, following announcement of this award decision, all submissions in response to the RFP are considered public records available for public inspection pursuant to the State of Maine Freedom of Access Act (FOAA). 1 M.R.S. §§ 401 et seq.; 5 M.R.S. § 1825-B (6).

This award decision is conditioned upon final approval by the State Procurement Review Committee and the successful negotiation of a contract. A Statement of Appeal Rights has been provided with this letter; see below.

Thank you for your interest in doing business with the State of Maine.

Sincerely,

Travis W. Doughty,
21st CCLC State Coordinator
Maine Department of Education

STATEMENT OF APPEAL RIGHTS

Any person aggrieved by an award decision may request an appeal hearing. The request must be made to the Director of the Bureau of General Services, in writing, within 15 days of notification of the contract award as provided in 5 M.R.S. § 1825-E (2) and the Rules of the Department of Administrative and Financial Services, Bureau of General Services, Division of Purchases, Chapter 120, § (2) (2).



**STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**

**Janet T. Mills
Governor**

**Pender Makin
Commissioner**

June 3, 2024

Ms. Jennifer Iacovelli
LearningWorks
181 Brackett Street
Portland, ME 04102

SUBJECT: Notice of Conditional Contract Award(s) under RFP # 202312249,
21st Century Community Learning Centers Program

Dear Ms. Iacovelli:

This letter is in regard to the subject Request for Proposals (RFP), issued by the State of Maine Department of Education for the 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program. The Department has evaluated the proposals received using the evaluation criteria identified in the RFP, and the Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award(s) to the following bidder(s):

- Boys & Girls Club of Kennebec Valley
- Franklin County Children's Task Force (RSU 58)
- Franklin County Children's Task Force (RSU 73)
- LearningWorks (Biddeford)
- LearningWorks (Portland) (EE&R)
- LearningWorks (Portland) (OA&P)
- LearningWorks (RSU 57)
- RSU 17/MSAD 17 (West Paris)
- RSU 24
- RSU 54/MSAD 54
- RSU 85/MSAD 19
- Westbrook Public Schools

The bidder(s) listed above received the evaluation team's highest ranking(s). The Department will be contacting the aforementioned bidder(s) soon to negotiate a contract. As provided in the RFP, the Notice of Conditional Contract Award is subject to execution of a written contract and, as a result, this Notice does NOT constitute the formation of a contract between the Department and the apparent successful vendor. The vendor shall not acquire any legal or equitable rights relative to the contract services until a contract containing terms and conditions acceptable to the Department is executed. The Department further reserves the right to cancel this Notice of Conditional Contract Award at any time prior to the execution of a written contract.

As stated in the RFP, following announcement of this award decision, all submissions in response to the RFP are considered public records available for public inspection pursuant to the State of Maine Freedom of Access Act (FOAA). 1 M.R.S. §§ 401 et seq.; 5 M.R.S. § 1825-B (6).

This award decision is conditioned upon final approval by the State Procurement Review Committee and the successful negotiation of a contract. A Statement of Appeal Rights has been provided with this letter; see below.

Thank you for your interest in doing business with the State of Maine.

Sincerely,

Travis W. Doughty,
21st CCLC State Coordinator
Maine Department of Education

STATEMENT OF APPEAL RIGHTS

Any person aggrieved by an award decision may request an appeal hearing. The request must be made to the Director of the Bureau of General Services, in writing, within 15 days of notification of the contract award as provided in 5 M.R.S. § 1825-E (2) and the Rules of the Department of Administrative and Financial Services, Bureau of General Services, Division of Purchases, Chapter 120, § (2) (2).



**STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**

**Janet T. Mills
Governor**

**Pender Makin
Commissioner**

June 3, 2024

Ms. Jessica McGreevy
RSU 17/MSAD 17
100 Pine Street
South Paris, ME 04281

SUBJECT: Notice of Conditional Contract Award(s) under RFP # 202312249,
21st Century Community Learning Centers Program

Dear Ms. McGreevy:

This letter is in regard to the subject Request for Proposals (RFP), issued by the State of Maine Department of Education for the 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program. The Department has evaluated the proposals received using the evaluation criteria identified in the RFP, and the Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award(s) to the following bidder(s):

- Boys & Girls Club of Kennebec Valley
- Franklin County Children's Task Force (RSU 58)
- Franklin County Children's Task Force (RSU 73)
- LearningWorks (Biddeford)
- LearningWorks (Portland) (EE&R)
- LearningWorks (Portland) (OA&P)
- LearningWorks (RSU 57)
- RSU 17/MSAD 17 (West Paris)
- RSU 24
- RSU 54/MSAD 54
- RSU 85/MSAD 19
- Westbrook Public Schools

The bidder(s) listed above received the evaluation team's highest ranking(s). The Department will be contacting the aforementioned bidder(s) soon to negotiate a contract. As provided in the RFP, the Notice of Conditional Contract Award is subject to execution of a written contract and, as a result, this Notice does NOT constitute the formation of a contract between the Department and the apparent successful vendor. The vendor shall not acquire any legal or equitable rights relative to the contract services until a contract containing terms and conditions acceptable to the Department is executed. The Department further reserves the right to cancel this Notice of Conditional Contract Award at any time prior to the execution of a written contract.

As stated in the RFP, following announcement of this award decision, all submissions in response to the RFP are considered public records available for public inspection pursuant to the State of Maine Freedom of Access Act (FOAA). 1 M.R.S. §§ 401 et seq.; 5 M.R.S. § 1825-B (6).

This award decision is conditioned upon final approval by the State Procurement Review Committee and the successful negotiation of a contract. A Statement of Appeal Rights has been provided with this letter; see below.

Thank you for your interest in doing business with the State of Maine.

Sincerely,

Travis W. Doughty,
21st CCLC State Coordinator
Maine Department of Education

STATEMENT OF APPEAL RIGHTS

Any person aggrieved by an award decision may request an appeal hearing. The request must be made to the Director of the Bureau of General Services, in writing, within 15 days of notification of the contract award as provided in 5 M.R.S. § 1825-E (2) and the Rules of the Department of Administrative and Financial Services, Bureau of General Services, Division of Purchases, Chapter 120, § (2) (2).



**STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**

**Janet T. Mills
Governor**

**Pender Makin
Commissioner**

June 3, 2024

Ms. Melanie Ellsworth
RSU 17/MSAD 17
232 Main Street
South Paris, ME 04281

SUBJECT: Notice of Conditional Contract Award(s) under RFP # 202312249,
21st Century Community Learning Centers Program

Dear Ms. Ellsworth:

This letter is in regard to the subject Request for Proposals (RFP), issued by the State of Maine Department of Education for the 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program. The Department has evaluated the proposals received using the evaluation criteria identified in the RFP, and the Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award(s) to the following bidder(s):

- Boys & Girls Club of Kennebec Valley
- Franklin County Children's Task Force (RSU 58)
- Franklin County Children's Task Force (RSU 73)
- LearningWorks (Biddeford)
- LearningWorks (Portland) (EE&R)
- LearningWorks (Portland) (OA&P)
- LearningWorks (RSU 57)
- RSU 17/MSAD 17 (West Paris)
- RSU 24
- RSU 54/MSAD 54
- RSU 85/MSAD 19
- Westbrook Public Schools

The bidder(s) listed above received the evaluation team's highest ranking(s). The Department will be contacting the aforementioned bidder(s) soon to negotiate a contract. As provided in the RFP, the Notice of Conditional Contract Award is subject to execution of a written contract and, as a result, this Notice does NOT constitute the formation of a contract between the Department and the apparent successful vendor. The vendor shall not acquire any legal or equitable rights relative to the contract services until a contract containing terms and conditions acceptable to the Department is executed. The Department further reserves the right to cancel this Notice of Conditional Contract Award at any time prior to the execution of a written contract.

As stated in the RFP, following announcement of this award decision, all submissions in response to the RFP are considered public records available for public inspection pursuant to the State of Maine Freedom of Access Act (FOAA). 1 M.R.S. §§ 401 et seq.; 5 M.R.S. § 1825-B (6).

This award decision is conditioned upon final approval by the State Procurement Review Committee and the successful negotiation of a contract. A Statement of Appeal Rights has been provided with this letter; see below.

Thank you for your interest in doing business with the State of Maine.

Sincerely,

Travis W. Doughty,
21st CCLC State Coordinator
Maine Department of Education

STATEMENT OF APPEAL RIGHTS

Any person aggrieved by an award decision may request an appeal hearing. The request must be made to the Director of the Bureau of General Services, in writing, within 15 days of notification of the contract award as provided in 5 M.R.S. § 1825-E (2) and the Rules of the Department of Administrative and Financial Services, Bureau of General Services, Division of Purchases, Chapter 120, § (2) (2).



**STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**

**Janet T. Mills
Governor**

**Pender Makin
Commissioner**

June 3, 2024

Ms. Kristen McFarland
RSU 24
2165 US Highway 1
Sullivan, ME 04664

SUBJECT: Notice of Conditional Contract Award(s) under RFP # 202312249,
21st Century Community Learning Centers Program

Dear Ms. McFarland:

This letter is in regard to the subject Request for Proposals (RFP), issued by the State of Maine Department of Education for the 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program. The Department has evaluated the proposals received using the evaluation criteria identified in the RFP, and the Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award(s) to the following bidder(s):

- Boys & Girls Club of Kennebec Valley
- Franklin County Children's Task Force (RSU 58)
- Franklin County Children's Task Force (RSU 73)
- LearningWorks (Biddeford)
- LearningWorks (Portland) (EE&R)
- LearningWorks (Portland) (OA&P)
- LearningWorks (RSU 57)
- RSU 17/MSAD 17 (West Paris)
- RSU 24
- RSU 54/MSAD 54
- RSU 85/MSAD 19
- Westbrook Public Schools

The bidder(s) listed above received the evaluation team's highest ranking(s). The Department will be contacting the aforementioned bidder(s) soon to negotiate a contract. As provided in the RFP, the Notice of Conditional Contract Award is subject to execution of a written contract and, as a result, this Notice does NOT constitute the formation of a contract between the Department and the apparent successful vendor. The vendor shall not acquire any legal or equitable rights relative to the contract services until a contract containing terms and conditions acceptable to the Department is executed. The Department further reserves the right to cancel this Notice of Conditional Contract Award at any time prior to the execution of a written contract.

As stated in the RFP, following announcement of this award decision, all submissions in response to the RFP are considered public records available for public inspection pursuant to the State of Maine Freedom of Access Act (FOAA). 1 M.R.S. §§ 401 et seq.; 5 M.R.S. § 1825-B (6).

This award decision is conditioned upon final approval by the State Procurement Review Committee and the successful negotiation of a contract. A Statement of Appeal Rights has been provided with this letter; see below.

Thank you for your interest in doing business with the State of Maine.

Sincerely,

Travis W. Doughty,
21st CCLC State Coordinator
Maine Department of Education

STATEMENT OF APPEAL RIGHTS

Any person aggrieved by an award decision may request an appeal hearing. The request must be made to the Director of the Bureau of General Services, in writing, within 15 days of notification of the contract award as provided in 5 M.R.S. § 1825-E (2) and the Rules of the Department of Administrative and Financial Services, Bureau of General Services, Division of Purchases, Chapter 120, § (2) (2).



**STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**

**Janet T. Mills
Governor**

**Pender Makin
Commissioner**

June 3, 2024

Ms. Dawn Fickett
RSU 54/MSAD 54
155 Academy Circle
Skowhegan, ME 04976

SUBJECT: Notice of Conditional Contract Award(s) under RFP # 202312249,
21st Century Community Learning Centers Program

Dear Ms. Fickett:

This letter is in regard to the subject Request for Proposals (RFP), issued by the State of Maine Department of Education for the 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program. The Department has evaluated the proposals received using the evaluation criteria identified in the RFP, and the Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award(s) to the following bidder(s):

- Boys & Girls Club of Kennebec Valley
- Franklin County Children's Task Force (RSU 58)
- Franklin County Children's Task Force (RSU 73)
- LearningWorks (Biddeford)
- LearningWorks (Portland) (EE&R)
- LearningWorks (Portland) (OA&P)
- LearningWorks (RSU 57)
- RSU 17/MSAD 17 (West Paris)
- RSU 24
- RSU 54/MSAD 54
- RSU 85/MSAD 19
- Westbrook Public Schools

The bidder(s) listed above received the evaluation team's highest ranking(s). The Department will be contacting the aforementioned bidder(s) soon to negotiate a contract. As provided in the RFP, the Notice of Conditional Contract Award is subject to execution of a written contract and, as a result, this Notice does NOT constitute the formation of a contract between the Department and the apparent successful vendor. The vendor shall not acquire any legal or equitable rights relative to the contract services until a contract containing terms and conditions acceptable to the Department is executed. The Department further reserves the right to cancel this Notice of Conditional Contract Award at any time prior to the execution of a written contract.

As stated in the RFP, following announcement of this award decision, all submissions in response to the RFP are considered public records available for public inspection pursuant to the State of Maine Freedom of Access Act (FOAA). 1 M.R.S. §§ 401 et seq.; 5 M.R.S. § 1825-B (6).

This award decision is conditioned upon final approval by the State Procurement Review Committee and the successful negotiation of a contract. A Statement of Appeal Rights has been provided with this letter; see below.

Thank you for your interest in doing business with the State of Maine.

Sincerely,

Travis W. Doughty,
21st CCLC State Coordinator
Maine Department of Education

STATEMENT OF APPEAL RIGHTS

Any person aggrieved by an award decision may request an appeal hearing. The request must be made to the Director of the Bureau of General Services, in writing, within 15 days of notification of the contract award as provided in 5 M.R.S. § 1825-E (2) and the Rules of the Department of Administrative and Financial Services, Bureau of General Services, Division of Purchases, Chapter 120, § (2) (2).



**STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**

**Janet T. Mills
Governor**

**Pender Makin
Commissioner**

June 3, 2024

Ms. Heather Rockwell
RSU 67
25 Airport Road
Lincoln, ME 04457

SUBJECT: Notice of Conditional Contract Award(s) under RFP # 202312249,
21st Century Community Learning Centers Program

Dear Ms. Rockwell:

This letter is in regard to the subject Request for Proposals (RFP), issued by the State of Maine Department of Education for the 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program. The Department has evaluated the proposals received using the evaluation criteria identified in the RFP, and the Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award(s) to the following bidder(s):

- Boys & Girls Club of Kennebec Valley
- Franklin County Children's Task Force (RSU 58)
- Franklin County Children's Task Force (RSU 73)
- LearningWorks (Biddeford)
- LearningWorks (Portland) (EE&R)
- LearningWorks (Portland) (OA&P)
- LearningWorks (RSU 57)
- RSU 17/MSAD 17 (West Paris)
- RSU 24
- RSU 54/MSAD 54
- RSU 85/MSAD 19
- Westbrook Public Schools

The bidder(s) listed above received the evaluation team's highest ranking(s). The Department will be contacting the aforementioned bidder(s) soon to negotiate a contract. As provided in the RFP, the Notice of Conditional Contract Award is subject to execution of a written contract and, as a result, this Notice does NOT constitute the formation of a contract between the Department and the apparent successful vendor. The vendor shall not acquire any legal or equitable rights relative to the contract services until a contract containing terms and conditions acceptable to the Department is executed. The Department further reserves the right to cancel this Notice of Conditional Contract Award at any time prior to the execution of a written contract.

As stated in the RFP, following announcement of this award decision, all submissions in response to the RFP are considered public records available for public inspection pursuant to the State of Maine Freedom of Access Act (FOAA). 1 M.R.S. §§ 401 et seq.; 5 M.R.S. § 1825-B (6).

This award decision is conditioned upon final approval by the State Procurement Review Committee and the successful negotiation of a contract. A Statement of Appeal Rights has been provided with this letter; see below.

Thank you for your interest in doing business with the State of Maine.

Sincerely,

Travis W. Doughty,
21st CCLC State Coordinator
Maine Department of Education

STATEMENT OF APPEAL RIGHTS

Any person aggrieved by an award decision may request an appeal hearing. The request must be made to the Director of the Bureau of General Services, in writing, within 15 days of notification of the contract award as provided in 5 M.R.S. § 1825-E (2) and the Rules of the Department of Administrative and Financial Services, Bureau of General Services, Division of Purchases, Chapter 120, § (2) (2).



**STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**

**Janet T. Mills
Governor**

**Pender Makin
Commissioner**

June 3, 2024

Ms. MaryEllen Day
RSU 85/MSAD 19
100 High Street
Eastport, ME 04631

SUBJECT: Notice of Conditional Contract Award(s) under RFP # 202312249,
21st Century Community Learning Centers Program

Dear Ms. Day:

This letter is in regard to the subject Request for Proposals (RFP), issued by the State of Maine Department of Education for the 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program. The Department has evaluated the proposals received using the evaluation criteria identified in the RFP, and the Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award(s) to the following bidder(s):

- Boys & Girls Club of Kennebec Valley
- Franklin County Children's Task Force (RSU 58)
- Franklin County Children's Task Force (RSU 73)
- LearningWorks (Biddeford)
- LearningWorks (Portland) (EE&R)
- LearningWorks (Portland) (OA&P)
- LearningWorks (RSU 57)
- RSU 17/MSAD 17 (West Paris)
- RSU 24
- RSU 54/MSAD 54
- RSU 85/MSAD 19
- Westbrook Public Schools

The bidder(s) listed above received the evaluation team's highest ranking(s). The Department will be contacting the aforementioned bidder(s) soon to negotiate a contract. As provided in the RFP, the Notice of Conditional Contract Award is subject to execution of a written contract and, as a result, this Notice does NOT constitute the formation of a contract between the Department and the apparent successful vendor. The vendor shall not acquire any legal or equitable rights relative to the contract services until a contract containing terms and conditions acceptable to the Department is executed. The Department further reserves the right to cancel this Notice of Conditional Contract Award at any time prior to the execution of a written contract.

As stated in the RFP, following announcement of this award decision, all submissions in response to the RFP are considered public records available for public inspection pursuant to the State of Maine Freedom of Access Act (FOAA). 1 M.R.S. §§ 401 et seq.; 5 M.R.S. § 1825-B (6).

This award decision is conditioned upon final approval by the State Procurement Review Committee and the successful negotiation of a contract. A Statement of Appeal Rights has been provided with this letter; see below.

Thank you for your interest in doing business with the State of Maine.

Sincerely,

Travis W. Doughty,
21st CCLC State Coordinator
Maine Department of Education

STATEMENT OF APPEAL RIGHTS

Any person aggrieved by an award decision may request an appeal hearing. The request must be made to the Director of the Bureau of General Services, in writing, within 15 days of notification of the contract award as provided in 5 M.R.S. § 1825-E (2) and the Rules of the Department of Administrative and Financial Services, Bureau of General Services, Division of Purchases, Chapter 120, § (2) (2).



**STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**

**Janet T. Mills
Governor**

**Pender Makin
Commissioner**

June 3, 2024

Ms. Emily Loder
Westbrook Public Schools
117 Stroudwater Street
Westbrook, ME 04092

SUBJECT: Notice of Conditional Contract Award(s) under RFP # 202312249,
21st Century Community Learning Centers Program

Dear Ms. Loder:

This letter is in regard to the subject Request for Proposals (RFP), issued by the State of Maine Department of Education for the 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program. The Department has evaluated the proposals received using the evaluation criteria identified in the RFP, and the Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award(s) to the following bidder(s):

- Boys & Girls Club of Kennebec Valley
- Franklin County Children's Task Force (RSU 58)
- Franklin County Children's Task Force (RSU 73)
- LearningWorks (Biddeford)
- LearningWorks (Portland) (EE&R)
- LearningWorks (Portland) (OA&P)
- LearningWorks (RSU 57)
- RSU 17/MSAD 17 (West Paris)
- RSU 24
- RSU 54/MSAD 54
- RSU 85/MSAD 19
- Westbrook Public Schools

The bidder(s) listed above received the evaluation team's highest ranking(s). The Department will be contacting the aforementioned bidder(s) soon to negotiate a contract. As provided in the RFP, the Notice of Conditional Contract Award is subject to execution of a written contract and, as a result, this Notice does NOT constitute the formation of a contract between the Department and the apparent successful vendor. The vendor shall not acquire any legal or equitable rights relative to the contract services until a contract containing terms and conditions acceptable to the Department is executed. The Department further reserves the right to cancel this Notice of Conditional Contract Award at any time prior to the execution of a written contract.

As stated in the RFP, following announcement of this award decision, all submissions in response to the RFP are considered public records available for public inspection pursuant to the State of Maine Freedom of Access Act (FOAA). 1 M.R.S. §§ 401 et seq.; 5 M.R.S. § 1825-B (6).

This award decision is conditioned upon final approval by the State Procurement Review Committee and the successful negotiation of a contract. A Statement of Appeal Rights has been provided with this letter; see below.

Thank you for your interest in doing business with the State of Maine.

Sincerely,

Travis W. Doughty,
21st CCLC State Coordinator
Maine Department of Education

STATEMENT OF APPEAL RIGHTS

Any person aggrieved by an award decision may request an appeal hearing. The request must be made to the Director of the Bureau of General Services, in writing, within 15 days of notification of the contract award as provided in 5 M.R.S. § 1825-E (2) and the Rules of the Department of Administrative and Financial Services, Bureau of General Services, Division of Purchases, Chapter 120, § (2) (2).

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION & NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: Boys & Girls Club of Kennebec Valley (RSU 12)
DATE: 05/08/24

Instructions: The purpose of this form is to record all evaluation notes and scoring that is obtained through consensus discussions among the full evaluation team for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. The RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator should complete this form and maintain the only copy. This form should reflect the full team's consensus evaluations, and this form is not meant to take the place of individual evaluation notes, which are still required from each member of the evaluation team. A separate form is available for individual evaluation notes. Please submit a copy of this document to the Division of Purchases as part of your contract award selection documents.

DEPARTMENT NAME: Education
NAME OF RFP COORDINATOR: Travis Doughty
NAMES OF EVALUATORS: Jessica Francis, Luba Greene, Rachelle Tome

POINT SUMMARY

Section I. General Information (Pass/Fail)

Required Item	Pass	Fail	Comments
1. Cover Sheet	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	-
2. Debarment Certification Form	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	-
3. Abstract	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	-
4. Program Demographics	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	-
5. Partners	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	-

Section II. Specifications of Work to Be Performed (55 Total Points)

Planning (Maximum 4 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
Description of the planning process used to submit the application	2	2
Planning meetings and collaborative writing sessions, including multiple parties	2	1
Need for Program (Maximum 6 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
Evaluation of community needs and available resources for the community learning center(s)	3	2
Description of how proposed program will address the identified community needs, in particular the needs of (primarily low-performing) students and working families	3	2
Program Design (Maximum 25 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
Range and type of program activities that will be offered and how those activities will improve student academic achievement and overall student success and align with the academic goals in Appendix D	2	2
Number of students and low-performing students that will be served at each site, grade-levels, average daily attendance	3	2
General schedule of operations for each proposed site is provided; the number of program days/hours are included and meet program minimums outlined in Appendix G	3	3
Staffing ratios alignment with the recommended instructor to student ratios outlined in Appendix G	2	2

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION & NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: Boys & Girls Club of Kennebec Valley (RSU 12)
DATE: 05/08/24

Elements of high-quality programming: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Linkages to School Day • Strong Instructional Leadership • Safe and Appropriate Environment • Student-Driven Programming • Regular Attendees 	5	4
All six (6) of the program goals for the 21 st CCLC program have been addressed within Appendix D and include the necessary strategies, activities, and proposed outcomes in the areas of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Academic Improvement • Health and Wellness • Educational Enrichment • Parent Education and Family Engagement • Sustainability and Collaboration • Professional and Staff Development 	6	6
All proposed outcomes in Appendix D match the required performance measures (percentages, numbers, frequencies, etc. are provided where requested) and appear realistic, given size and scope of the proposal	4	3
Program Management (Maximum 10 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
Elements of program management: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program Leadership • School Leadership Support • Staff and Professional Development • Communication/Information Dissemination • Transportation • Volunteers 	10	10
Program Evaluation (Maximum 10 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
Description of how the program(s) will be based on the following “measures of effectiveness”: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. be based upon an assessment of objective data regarding the need for before and after school (or summer recess) programs and activities in the schools and communities; ii. be based upon an established set of performance measures aimed at ensuring the availability of high-quality academic enrichment programs; iii. if appropriate, be based upon evidence-based research that the program or activity will help students meet the challenging State academic standards and any local academic standards; iv. ensure that measures of student success align with the regular academic program of the school and academic needs of participating students and include performance indicators and measures as determined by the state; and v. collect the data necessary for the measures of student success described in subparagraph (iv) above. 	4	3
Periodic evaluation to assess the providers progress toward its goal of providing high-quality opportunities for academic enrichment	3	2
Results of a periodic evaluation of the proposed program will refine, improve, and strengthen the program and its performance measures as well as how and when the results of periodic evaluations will be made available to the public and used to build community support.	3	2
Section II Total (Max. 55 Points)		46

Section III. Budget Proposal (38 Total Points)

Budget Narrative and Budget Forms (Maximum 25 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
Budget Narrative describes how items within the budget will support the achievement of program goals and performance measures outlined in Appendix D	4	4
Budget Narrative aligns with and provides an explanation of content in the budget forms	3	3

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION & NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: Boys & Girls Club of Kennebec Valley (RSU 12)
DATE: 05/08/24

Items are addressed within the Budget Narrative: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Estimated cost per regular, low-performing student • Evidence is provided that there is a commitment of adequate resources for all participants • Fee structure is described, if applicable • Federal, State, and local program resources • Purpose of all expenditures has been described • In-kind contributions from partners that demonstrate the capacity to sustain programming 	6	6
Budget Forms – 001, 002, 003, 004, and 005: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are complete and align with the budget narrative • Illustrate that program transportation costs are shared, with the local school district contributing at least 35% of the overall annual transportation cost • Provide evidence that the requested amount is appropriate and reasonable for the size and scope of the project (most funds going towards expenses directly impacting programming for students) • Provide detailed line-item descriptions (e.g., hours worked per week, rate of pay, weeks per year) • Demonstrate a detailed and logical connection to program goals 	12	10
Capacity for Success and Sustainability (Maximum 13 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
Program advisory board member information has been provided and represents a diverse group of stakeholders	4	3
Sustainability plan, which describes how the community learning center(s) included within the proposal will continue to operate without 21 st CCLC program funding after the anticipated award period ends	5	4
Roles and commitment of key partners, including involvement with program design and implementation	4	4
Section III Total (Max. 38 points)		34

Section IV. Priority Points (7 Total Points)

Priority Points (Maximum 7 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
<u>Poverty Level:</u>		
Percentage of school population eligible for free and reduced-price lunch	Less than 45%	Between 45% and 59%
	Between 60% and 75%	Greater than 75%
Point Scale	0 Points	1 Point
	2 Points	3 Points
	3	0
<u>ESEA Accountability Status:</u>		
ESEA accountability status of the school(s) included within the application	No school(s) eligible for “Tier 1”, “Tier 2”, or “Tier 3” support	One or more schools eligible for “Tier 1” or “Tier 2” support
	One or more schools eligible for “Tier 3” support	
Priority points	0 Points	1 Point
	2 Points	2 Points
	2	1
<u>Other Need:</u>		
Level of evidence within the application	No Evidence	Moderate Evidence
	High Evidence	
Priority points	0 Points	1 Point
	2 Points	2 Points
	2	0
Section V Total (Max. 7 points)		1
OFFICIAL SCORE (Max. 100 points)		81

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION & NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: Boys & Girls Club of Kennebec Valley (RSU 12)
DATE: 05/08/24

EVALUATION TEAM NOTES

Section II. Specifications of Work to be Performed	Points Possible: 55	Score: 46
<p>Evaluation Team Comments:</p> <p>The overall planning process started in February and ended in March, which the review team noted as a somewhat short timeline. Those individuals who engaged in the planning process also appeared to be those in administrative roles. However, it was difficult to discern which organization various planning team members were from. Only names and no affiliation information were provided. The review team also noted that there seemed to be a lack of community members or parents engaged in the planning process.</p> <p>The needs assessment noted that a high number of students are not meeting grade level expectations in reading and mathematics based on NWEA results. There was also mention of local poverty rates with many students and families living below the poverty line. The bidder's response noted current the progress and success of existing programming but did not seem to clearly articulate how the proposed program would serve to address the needs of identified students and families. This was perhaps meant as an inference from past success. However, the review team would've liked more specific information on how this proposed program would serve to address the identified needs.</p> <p>The bidder intends to provide a wide range of programming to support the needs and interests of participating students, including hands-on and project-based learning opportunities. The review team noted a discrepancy between the number of students noted in the average daily attendance fields for the "LP" student group versus the "ALL" student group. In one portion of the proposal, the bidder noted 84 students per day and 50 LP students per day. In another section these same figures were noted as 50 students per day and 28 LP students per day. It was not clear to the review team which set of figures was accurate. The school year and summer programs meet the minimum instructional day and hour requirements outlined in Appendix G of the RFP, with the Sandra Prescott Clubhouse site far exceeding the minimum requirements. The staff-to-student ratios presented in the proposal fell within the requirements of Appendix G. However, the review team did note that the academic tutoring ratios were on the higher end of the allowable range.</p> <p>The bidder's response indicated that school day staff are actively involved in the program and that teachers have had longevity in the program. Program staff have access to and help reinforce the regular classroom curriculum for students. There were also multiple measures in place to ensure student safety. The review team also made note of a strong mentorship component in the bidder's response. The narrative response provided around regular attendance made reference to doing "what has worked in the past". It was not clear to the review team what this meant, and the team would have appreciated more specific information as to the work that would be done to ensure students attend the program regularly. The team also had questions around how the bidder would coordinate with the two different school districts it plans to work with through this proposal. It felt like more information could've been provided in this regard. Appendix D of the proposal was well-developed with appropriate strategies and activities to help the program achieve its goals. However, the review team felt that the academic improvement goals appeared to be low (15% in year one)—particularly in comparison to the number of students who are currently performing below grade level expectations. The team felt these proposed outcomes could have been a bit higher and still been very achievable for the program.</p> <p>The proposal provided evidence of an experienced leader being in place to oversee the implementation of the proposed program. There was also a commitment from staff to return and work in the program if it is awarded funding. Transportation was noted as being available to all students. The volunteer process was strong, with appropriate screening and training processes to onboard volunteer staff. The team also liked that the volunteer pool included opportunities for high school students. The team had questions around the intent to offer daily progress reports for students and whether this work would be feasible.</p> <p>The plans for program evaluation included several different data sources, but the review team questioned what the timeline for the proposed evaluation process looks like and how all of the various data collected would come together in a way that can be analyzed to determine next steps for continuous improvement. The review team also questioned how and when the results of the bidder's evaluation work would be shared with stakeholders. It would have been nice to hear about plans for sharing the evaluation results with the program's advisory board or other partners to help determine next steps for needed improvement work.</p>		
Section III. Budget Proposal	Points Possible: 38	Score: 34
<p>Evaluation Team Comments:</p> <p>The overall budget narrative seemed to align with the proposed goals in Appendix D of the proposal. The budget narrative indicated that 121 RLP students would be served at a cost of \$2,685.95 per RLP student. The school year program is noted as not having any fees. However, the summer program is noted as having a sliding fee scale that would align with childcare subsidy rates. The review</p>		

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION & NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: Boys & Girls Club of Kennebec Valley (RSU 12)
DATE: 05/08/24

team also noted that the bidder indicated that no child or family would be turned away from summer programming for their inability to pay fees.

The overall transportation budget for the year totaled \$47,816.00 with \$31,416.00 (65%) being contributed by the partnering school districts (RSU 11 and RSU 12). On Form 001, the bidder indicates receiving \$12,000 from the Maine DOE Summer Food Service program, but then on Form 005, the bidder has budgeted the same \$12,000 for food from the 21st CCLC grant award. This appears to be "double dipping" for the same expenses from both the Summer Food Service Program and 21st CCLC grant award. The team questioned whether this was an error or if the true cost for providing student meals was greater than noted on Form 005. On Form 003, the review team questioned why there was such a disparity between different staff who are fulfilling similar positions within the organization. For example, it was unclear why some site coordinators were making nearly 30% more per hour than others. Additionally, the funding amount budgeted for supplies (\$25,000) appears to conflict with other information provided in the budget narrative around contributions of supplies for the partnering school districts.

The program's advisory board includes 15 members, with representation of students and parents. However, the review team noted there wasn't any representative from RSU 12 noted. The review team also questioned why there were no administrative representatives from either partnering school district included in the program's advisory board. These are critical individuals who should be involved in the process. The preliminary sustainability plans seemed to be more of a summary of what the bidder has done in the past as opposed to plans for what they would do in the future. There was mention of further building relationships and community partnerships. However, the specific actions steps that would be taken were a bit vague. The roles and commitments of both the bidder and the partnering school districts are well described.

Section IV. Priority Points	Points Possible: 7	Score: <u>1</u>
------------------------------------	---------------------------	------------------------

Evaluation Team Comments:

The average free and reduced lunch rate of the school(s) included within the proposal totaled 40%.

One or more Tier 1 schools have been included in the proposal.

Overall, the proposal provided a low level of evidence for other need, citing mainly economic and academic factors impacting students and families in the local communities.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION & NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: Franklin County Children’s Task Force (RSU 58)
DATE: 05/08/24

Instructions: The purpose of this form is to record all evaluation notes and scoring that is obtained through consensus discussions among the full evaluation team for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. The RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator should complete this form and maintain the only copy. This form should reflect the full team’s consensus evaluations, and this form is not meant to take the place of individual evaluation notes, which are still required from each member of the evaluation team. A separate form is available for individual evaluation notes. Please submit a copy of this document to the Division of Purchases as part of your contract award selection documents.

DEPARTMENT NAME: Education
NAME OF RFP COORDINATOR: Travis Doughty
NAMES OF EVALUATORS: Jessica Francis, Luba Greene, Rachelle Tome

POINT SUMMARY

Section I. General Information (Pass/Fail)

Required Item	Pass	Fail	Comments
1. Cover Sheet	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	-
2. Debarment Certification Form	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	-
3. Abstract	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	-
4. Program Demographics	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	-
5. Partners	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	-

Section II. Specifications of Work to Be Performed (55 Total Points)

Planning (Maximum 4 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
Description of the planning process used to submit the application	2	2
Planning meetings and collaborative writing sessions, including multiple parties	2	1
Need for Program (Maximum 6 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
Evaluation of community needs and available resources for the community learning center(s)	3	2
Description of how proposed program will address the identified community needs, in particular the needs of (primarily low-performing) students and working families	3	3
Program Design (Maximum 25 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
Range and type of program activities that will be offered and how those activities will improve student academic achievement and overall student success and align with the academic goals in Appendix D	2	2
Number of students and low-performing students that will be served at each site, grade-levels, average daily attendance	3	2
General schedule of operations for each proposed site is provided; the number of program days/hours are included and meet program minimums outlined in Appendix G	3	3
Staffing ratios alignment with the recommended instructor to student ratios outlined in Appendix G	2	2

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION & NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: Franklin County Children’s Task Force (RSU 58)
DATE: 05/08/24

Elements of high-quality programming: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Linkages to School Day • Strong Instructional Leadership • Safe and Appropriate Environment • Student-Driven Programming • Regular Attendees 	5	5
All six (6) of the program goals for the 21 st CCLC program have been addressed within Appendix D and include the necessary strategies, activities, and proposed outcomes in the areas of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Academic Improvement • Health and Wellness • Educational Enrichment • Parent Education and Family Engagement • Sustainability and Collaboration • Professional and Staff Development 	6	6
All proposed outcomes in Appendix D match the required performance measures (percentages, numbers, frequencies, etc. are provided where requested) and appear realistic, given size and scope of the proposal	4	3
Program Management (Maximum 10 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
Elements of program management: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program Leadership • School Leadership Support • Staff and Professional Development • Communication/Information Dissemination • Transportation • Volunteers 	10	9
Program Evaluation (Maximum 10 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
Description of how the program(s) will be based on the following “measures of effectiveness”: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. be based upon an assessment of objective data regarding the need for before and after school (or summer recess) programs and activities in the schools and communities; ii. be based upon an established set of performance measures aimed at ensuring the availability of high-quality academic enrichment programs; iii. if appropriate, be based upon evidence-based research that the program or activity will help students meet the challenging State academic standards and any local academic standards; iv. ensure that measures of student success align with the regular academic program of the school and academic needs of participating students and include performance indicators and measures as determined by the state; and v. collect the data necessary for the measures of student success described in subparagraph (iv) above. 	4	4
Periodic evaluation to assess the providers progress toward its goal of providing high-quality opportunities for academic enrichment	3	2
Results of a periodic evaluation of the proposed program will refine, improve, and strengthen the program and its performance measures as well as how and when the results of periodic evaluations will be made available to the public and used to build community support.	3	3
Section II Total (Max. 55 Points)		49

Section III. Budget Proposal (38 Total Points)

Budget Narrative and Budget Forms (Maximum 25 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
Budget Narrative describes how items within the budget will support the achievement of program goals and performance measures outlined in Appendix D	4	4
Budget Narrative aligns with and provides an explanation of content in the budget forms	3	2

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION & NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: Franklin County Children’s Task Force (RSU 58)
DATE: 05/08/24

Items are addressed within the Budget Narrative: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Estimated cost per regular, low-performing student • Evidence is provided that there is a commitment of adequate resources for all participants • Fee structure is described, if applicable • Federal, State, and local program resources • Purpose of all expenditures has been described • In-kind contributions from partners that demonstrate the capacity to sustain programming 	6	5
Budget Forms – 001, 002, 003, 004, and 005: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are complete and align with the budget narrative • Illustrate that program transportation costs are shared, with the local school district contributing at least 35% of the overall annual transportation cost • Provide evidence that the requested amount is appropriate and reasonable for the size and scope of the project (most funds going towards expenses directly impacting programming for students) • Provide detailed line-item descriptions (e.g., hours worked per week, rate of pay, weeks per year) • Demonstrate a detailed and logical connection to program goals 	12	10
Capacity for Success and Sustainability (Maximum 13 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
Program advisory board member information has been provided and represents a diverse group of stakeholders	4	4
Sustainability plan, which describes how the community learning center(s) included within the proposal will continue to operate without 21 st CCLC program funding after the anticipated award period ends	5	5
Roles and commitment of key partners, including involvement with program design and implementation	4	4
Section III Total (Max. 38 points)		34

Section IV. Priority Points (7 Total Points)

Priority Points (Maximum 7 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
<u>Poverty Level:</u>		
Percentage of school population eligible for free and reduced-price lunch	Less than 45% Between 45% and 59% Between 60% and 75% Greater than 75%	3
Point Scale	0 Points 1 Point 2 Points 3 Points	1
<u>ESEA Accountability Status:</u>		
ESEA accountability status of the school(s) included within the application	No school(s) eligible for “Tier 1”, “Tier 2”, or “Tier 3” support One or more schools eligible for “Tier 1” or “Tier 2” support One or more schools eligible for “Tier 3” support	2
Priority points	0 Points 1 Point 2 Points	0
<u>Other Need:</u>		
Level of evidence within the application	No Evidence Moderate Evidence High Evidence	2
Priority points	0 Points 1 Point 2 Points	1
Section V Total (Max. 7 points)		2
OFFICIAL SCORE (Max. 100 points)		85

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION & NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: Franklin County Children’s Task Force (RSU 58)
DATE: 05/08/24

EVALUATION TEAM NOTES

Section II. Specifications of Work to be Performed	Points Possible: 55	Score: <u>49</u>
<p>Evaluation Team Comments:</p> <p>The overall planning process began in June and concluded in April, totaling over 80 hours of planning time. There was evidence of multiple planning sessions and meetings that occurred to develop the proposal. However, it is noted that it was not always clear what stakeholder groups or organizations meeting participants represented.</p> <p>The needs assessment noted several areas of challenge for area students and families, including high poverty and unemployment rates, single-parent households, etc. The bidder indicated a focus on promoting protective factors that address impacts of trauma and challenges of rural living. This was particularly positive in terms of addressing the concerns of ACES. The review team would’ve liked a bit more specific data around the academic needs of students targeted in the proposal, as much of the data provided appeared to be related to non-academic factors impacting students and families. The plans for addressing the needs that were identified appeared sound and would serve to address the needs of students during the proposed after-school program.</p> <p>There’s a range of program activities described as being offered by the bidder, which include a good mix of academic and non-academic supports. The number of students and RLP students to be served annually seems reasonable, given the size of the schools. However, the review team noted a discrepancy in the total number of RLP students proposed to be served. In this section of the proposal, the total RLP count is 96 students but earlier in the proposal the bidder notes serving 100 RLP students annually. Is it unclear which is the correct figure. It is noted that there are three separate program sites to be operated during the school year and one consolidated site during the summer. The proposed school year and summer instructional hours meet the minimum requirements set forth in Appendix G of the proposal. The staff-to-student ratios for each type of programming included a range instead of a distinct number or goal the bidder would agree to commit to. As such, it appears that the bidder’s ratios are within the allowable range of the RFP, but on the high end of that range.</p> <p>The narrative provided indicates strong communication channels between the bidder and school district. Program staff will be comprised of bidder and school district staff as well as local university students who are pursuing teaching licenses. There was also evidence of shared training in restorative practices and regular communication with bus drivers regarding student behavior. There was a very strong response provided about ensuring the physical and emotional safety of students. Center and school leadership teams regularly review student progress and outcomes as well as address barriers to regular attendance of students.</p> <p>The bidder’s response in Appendix D was very strong overall and felt cohesive with information provided in other sections of the proposal. While the overall goals for the program were clearly outlined, the review team felt that some of the goals were a bit low—particularly those around improvements for student academic achievement. Under the health and wellness goal area, the review team really liked the “care and share” food club idea as well as the strategy of having milestone achievement awards for encouraging regular student attendance. The review team also noted many creative ideas and positive approaches to family engagement outlined in this portion of the proposal.</p> <p>The proposal indicated that the individual hired for the program director position would require somewhat minimal qualifications given the expectations of the person who would ultimately fulfill this role. Other than collaborative planning at certain times of the year, it seems that ongoing support from school or district leaders is minimal. That said, collaboration with the schools for professional development was solid, with shared professional development opportunities being the goal. The review team had some concerns around the use of pick-up and drop-off locations for summer program transportation. The team wondered how a student without any transportation options would be able to participate in the summer program. The team appreciated that program staff would be on the bus with students and drivers to help address student behavior and maintain a safe environment for students. The use of a student “speakers bureau” was particularly innovative and noted as positive by the review team. The bidder organization is also noted as being a member of the local chamber of commerce to further support the development of partnerships and sharing information about their organization and programs.</p> <p>The narrative provided around evaluation was fairly descriptive and included a mix of various student assessment data as well as the use of survey data from parents, teachers, and students. The review team also appreciated that the bidder would leverage a parent advisory group to obtain feedback and input about the program. It was also not entirely clear to the review team how the data collected would be reviewed and analyzed to inform needed changes or improvements to program delivery. There was a logical plan presented for how the results of evaluation work would be shared with key stakeholders twice per year.</p>		

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION & NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: Franklin County Children’s Task Force (RSU 58)
DATE: 05/08/24

Section III. Budget Proposal	Points Possible: 38	Score: <u>34</u>
-------------------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------------

Evaluation Team Comments:

The information presented in the budget narrative seemed fairly well aligned with the goals presented in Appendix D. The overall estimated cost per RLP student within the budget narrative is noted as \$2,700. It is also noted that no fees will be charged to students or parents for participation in the program. Evidence of strong in-kind contributions from the bidding organization, partnering school district, and University of Maine at Farmington are present. The bidding organization notes a strong history of blending and braiding funding from several state and local sources. However, it was unclear whether many of the federal, state, and local organizations listed were actively going to contribute to the proposed program or have simply worked with the bidder in the past.

The annual cost of transportation cost (\$77,500) for the program is being covered by the local school district. On Form 001, it seemed that the program budgeted for its in-kind contributions under the incorrect funding lines. For example, the use of classroom space in each of the schools should have been budgeted for under “6. Occupancy Expense” and not under “16. Other”. The \$31,100 on Form 001 for in-kind staff funding was not represented in Form 003 and the associated positions that are funded through this in-kind amount were not included on Form 003. The review team wondered why these additional positions for the program were not included here.

The program’s advisory board included 19 members, with a good deal of variety in representation from different stakeholder groups. One parent as well as school leadership are noted as serving on the board. It would be nice if parent participation could be increased to at least one parent from each school. A variety of strategies were listed in the sustainability plan response to support the long-term success of the program. This included expanding partnerships with outside organizations such as the University of Maine as well as applying for supplemental grants and funding. The plan presented included measurable and concrete action steps. The review team particularly likes the marketing components of the plan and goal to make 21st century kids a “household name”. The overall roles and commitments between the bidder and partnering school district were sound, including shared professional development and coordination in the hiring of program staff.

Section IV. Priority Points	Points Possible: 7	Score: <u>2</u>
------------------------------------	---------------------------	------------------------

Evaluation Team Comments:

The average free and reduced lunch rate of the school(s) included within the proposal totaled 48%.

No Tier 1, 2, or 3 schools have been included in the proposal.

Overall, the proposal provided a moderate level of evidence for other need, citing rural and social determinants of health impacting childhood obesity—which has been noted as a top health concern in Franklin County. The proposal noted higher rates of single-parent families and partner violence as compared to other parts of the state. The proposal also made note of high rates of substance abuse and untreated mental health conditions among local residents. While the proposal incorporated a good deal of narrative around additional needs of the local school communities, much of the data provided appeared anecdotal and did not really provide specific data points from which the team could draw conclusions.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION & NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: Franklin County Children’s Task Force (RSU 73)
DATE: 05/31/24

Instructions: The purpose of this form is to record all evaluation notes and scoring that is obtained through consensus discussions among the full evaluation team for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. The RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator should complete this form and maintain the only copy. This form should reflect the full team’s consensus evaluations, and this form is not meant to take the place of individual evaluation notes, which are still required from each member of the evaluation team. A separate form is available for individual evaluation notes. Please submit a copy of this document to the Division of Purchases as part of your contract award selection documents.

DEPARTMENT NAME: Education
NAME OF RFP COORDINATOR: Travis Doughty
NAMES OF EVALUATORS: Jessica Francis, Luba Greene, Rachelle Tome

POINT SUMMARY

Section I. General Information (Pass/Fail)

Required Item	Pass	Fail	Comments
1. Cover Sheet	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	-
2. Debarment Certification Form	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	-
3. Abstract	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	-
4. Program Demographics	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	-
5. Partners	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	-

Section II. Specifications of Work to Be Performed (55 Total Points)

Planning (Maximum 4 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
Description of the planning process used to submit the application	2	2
Planning meetings and collaborative writing sessions, including multiple parties	2	2
Need for Program (Maximum 6 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
Evaluation of community needs and available resources for the community learning center(s)	3	2
Description of how proposed program will address the identified community needs, in particular the needs of (primarily low-performing) students and working families	3	3
Program Design (Maximum 25 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
Range and type of program activities that will be offered and how those activities will improve student academic achievement and overall student success and align with the academic goals in Appendix D	2	2
Number of students and low-performing students that will be served at each site, grade-levels, average daily attendance	3	3
General schedule of operations for each proposed site is provided; the number of program days/hours are included and meet program minimums outlined in Appendix G	3	3
Staffing ratios alignment with the recommended instructor to student ratios outlined in Appendix G	2	1

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION & NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: Franklin County Children’s Task Force (RSU 73)
DATE: 05/31/24

Elements of high-quality programming: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Linkages to School Day • Strong Instructional Leadership • Safe and Appropriate Environment • Student-Driven Programming • Regular Attendees 	5	4
All six (6) of the program goals for the 21 st CCLC program have been addressed within Appendix D and include the necessary strategies, activities, and proposed outcomes in the areas of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Academic Improvement • Health and Wellness • Educational Enrichment • Parent Education and Family Engagement • Sustainability and Collaboration • Professional and Staff Development 	6	5
All proposed outcomes in Appendix D match the required performance measures (percentages, numbers, frequencies, etc. are provided where requested) and appear realistic, given size and scope of the proposal	4	3
Program Management (Maximum 10 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
Elements of program management: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program Leadership • School Leadership Support • Staff and Professional Development • Communication/Information Dissemination • Transportation • Volunteers 	10	9
Program Evaluation (Maximum 10 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
Description of how the program(s) will be based on the following “measures of effectiveness”: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. be based upon an assessment of objective data regarding the need for before and after school (or summer recess) programs and activities in the schools and communities; ii. be based upon an established set of performance measures aimed at ensuring the availability of high-quality academic enrichment programs; iii. if appropriate, be based upon evidence-based research that the program or activity will help students meet the challenging State academic standards and any local academic standards; iv. ensure that measures of student success align with the regular academic program of the school and academic needs of participating students and include performance indicators and measures as determined by the state; and v. collect the data necessary for the measures of student success described in subparagraph (iv) above. 	4	4
Periodic evaluation to assess the providers progress toward its goal of providing high-quality opportunities for academic enrichment	3	3
Results of a periodic evaluation of the proposed program will refine, improve, and strengthen the program and its performance measures as well as how and when the results of periodic evaluations will be made available to the public and used to build community support.	3	3
Section II Total (Max. 55 Points)		49

Section III. Budget Proposal (38 Total Points)

Budget Narrative and Budget Forms (Maximum 25 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
Budget Narrative describes how items within the budget will support the achievement of program goals and performance measures outlined in Appendix D	4	4
Budget Narrative aligns with and provides an explanation of content in the budget forms	3	2

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION & NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: Franklin County Children’s Task Force (RSU 73)
DATE: 05/31/24

Items are addressed within the Budget Narrative: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Estimated cost per regular, low-performing student • Evidence is provided that there is a commitment of adequate resources for all participants • Fee structure is described, if applicable • Federal, State, and local program resources • Purpose of all expenditures has been described • In-kind contributions from partners that demonstrate the capacity to sustain programming 	6	6
Budget Forms – 001, 002, 003, 004, and 005: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are complete and align with the budget narrative • Illustrate that program transportation costs are shared, with the local school district contributing at least 35% of the overall annual transportation cost • Provide evidence that the requested amount is appropriate and reasonable for the size and scope of the project (most funds going towards expenses directly impacting programming for students) • Provide detailed line-item descriptions (e.g., hours worked per week, rate of pay, weeks per year) • Demonstrate a detailed and logical connection to program goals 	12	11
Capacity for Success and Sustainability (Maximum 13 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
Program advisory board member information has been provided and represents a diverse group of stakeholders	4	4
Sustainability plan, which describes how the community learning center(s) included within the proposal will continue to operate without 21 st CCLC program funding after the anticipated award period ends	5	5
Roles and commitment of key partners, including involvement with program design and implementation	4	4
Section III Total (Max. 38 points)		36

Section IV. Priority Points (7 Total Points)

Priority Points (Maximum 7 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
<u>Poverty Level:</u>		
Percentage of school population eligible for free and reduced-price lunch	Less than 45%	Between 45% and 59%
	Between 60% and 75%	Greater than 75%
Point Scale	0 Points	1 Point
	2 Points	3 Points
<u>ESEA Accountability Status:</u>		
ESEA accountability status of the school(s) included within the application	No school(s) eligible for “Tier 1”, “Tier 2”, or “Tier 3” support	One or more schools eligible for “Tier 1” or “Tier 2” support
	One or more schools eligible for “Tier 3” support	
Priority points	0 Points	1 Point
	2 Points	
<u>Other Need:</u>		
Level of evidence within the application	No Evidence	Moderate Evidence
	High Evidence	
Priority points	0 Points	1 Point
	2 Points	
Section V Total (Max. 7 points)		5
OFFICIAL SCORE (Max. 100 points)		90

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION & NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: Franklin County Children’s Task Force (RSU 73)
DATE: 05/31/24

EVALUATION TEAM NOTES

Section II. Specifications of Work to be Performed	Points Possible: 55	Score: <u>49</u>
<p>Evaluation Team Comments:</p> <p>The planning process for the proposal was robust and inclusive, with many key stakeholder groups included. The process began in June and concluded in April, spanning over 60 hours in total planning time. The review team did note, however, that the timeline became a bit vaguer as to the individuals involved in the planning process further into the planning timeline.</p> <p>There was also a good bit of evidence of community support for the program, with several community partners. The overall needs assessment documented evidence of high need (DHHS involvement, MIYHS data, Title I status, etc.). There was mention of economic impacts to the local school community with the closure of a major employer in the area (Verso). The review team did note that there was minimal academic performance data noted in the needs assessment portion of the proposal.</p> <p>The proposal included an intentional program design that seems to build upon a history of success. The review team also noted that the staff-to-student ratios for different program types were provided as ranges instead of specific ratios. The team would’ve liked to see more specific figures in this section of the proposal. The program includes the use of college students to help staff the program—this is through a strong partnership with UMF. The review team questioned the fact that there didn’t appear to be much in the way of planned face-to-face meetings between the bidder organization and the school district. There appeared to be a higher level of coordination with the elementary grade programs and less so for the middle school program. The overall goals included within Appendix D of the proposal were reasonable, balancing rigor with reality. However, the review team noted that the academic goals for the program seemed a bit low. It was hard to tell how reasonable these goals were without having baseline data provided in the needs assessment section of the proposal. Additionally, the strategies and activities for this section did not include much in the way of evidence-based practices.</p> <p>There is a proven track record of partnership with school and district leadership. The coordination of services during the school day extends into the afterschool program. The review team appreciated the use of restorative practices throughout the school district and that those practices would extend into the after-school program. Highly qualified staff are hired for the program with program staff and school day instructors participating in shared professional development. Bidder intends to hire a full-time program director with adequate experience to fulfill the obligations of the role. The Review Team had questions around the plans for student transportation and the use of pick-up and drop-off locations as a way to address barriers to transportation. It was unclear how families with transportation challenges would make it to a designated pick-up or drop-off location. The use of background checks for volunteer staff is present within the proposal. Strong partnership with the local university to secure staff for the program.</p> <p>The bidder indicated the use of formative assessments, IEP data, and other data from students and parents would be used in order to inform their evaluation work. It was also noted that periodic administration of student surveys (multiple times a year) would be used to inform their program design and better engage students. Presentations to stakeholders are noted as being planned for twice per year. The program coordinator and district leadership are continuing to work together to review data and inform next steps for continuous improvement activities.</p>		
Section III. Budget Proposal	Points Possible: 38	Score: <u>36</u>
<p>Evaluation Team Comments:</p> <p>The budget narrative presented aligned well with the goals outlined in Appendix D. There is also alignment between the content of the budget narrative and the budget forms. However, the review team did note that the private funding mentioned in the budget narrative did not exactly match the funding sources in the budget forms. The bidder’s proposed \$2,700 cost-per-RLP student falls within the allowable range for the RFP. The funding requested supports the delivery of the program and not the administrative overhead for the program, with adequate resources from partners. It is noted that there is \$100,000 for transportation from the school district, with a small amount of additional funding for field trip transportation coming from the 21st CCLC grant. The proposal notes that program fees will not be charged to students or families in order to participate in the proposed program.</p> <p>The content of the budget forms seems appropriate and reasonable. There is a significant amount of in-kind from partners that will help support the implementation of the program. However, the review team did question the designation of \$44,400.00 for in-kind salaries and wages as opposed to contracted services—particularly for the costs of providing professional development for staff. The line-item descriptions throughout the budget forms provided sufficient details to ensure the review team understood the scope of the proposed expenses.</p>		

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION & NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: Franklin County Children's Task Force (RSU 73)
DATE: 05/31/24

The program's advisory board is already formed and has a diverse group of stakeholder representatives, totaling 20 members. An innovative sustainability plan, which includes rotating membership, for growth and increasing participation and partners was presented. There's a notable amount of in-kind contributions from various partners. The bidder's response here could have been stronger by providing more detailed and logical action steps to be taken over the next 4 years. There's evidence of a strong partnership with the local university (UMF) and other partnering organizations that could support the long-term success of the program. However, this was not clearly articulated within the proposal.

Section IV. Priority Points

Points Possible: **7**

Score: **5**

Evaluation Team Comments:

The average free and reduced lunch rate of the school(s) included within the proposal totaled 49%.

One or more Tier 3 schools have been included in the proposal.

Overall, the proposal provided a high level of evidence for other needs, citing the closer of the major employer (Verso) as an economic strain on families and the local community. There were also notable instances of CPS/DHHS involvement. The number of low-performing students across all schools was high and the Bidder noted a lack of safe places for students after school. The local results from the Maine Integrated Youth Health Survey (MIYHS) data showed high instances of students engaging in risky behaviors.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION & NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: LearningWorks (Biddeford Public Schools)
DATE: 05/31/24

Instructions: The purpose of this form is to record all evaluation notes and scoring that is obtained through consensus discussions among the full evaluation team for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. The RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator should complete this form and maintain the only copy. This form should reflect the full team's consensus evaluations, and this form is not meant to take the place of individual evaluation notes, which are still required from each member of the evaluation team. A separate form is available for individual evaluation notes. Please submit a copy of this document to the Division of Purchases as part of your contract award selection documents.

DEPARTMENT NAME: Education
NAME OF RFP COORDINATOR: Travis Doughty
NAMES OF EVALUATORS: Jessica Francis, Luba Greene, Rachelle Tome

POINT SUMMARY

Section I. General Information (Pass/Fail)

Required Item	Pass	Fail	Comments
1. Cover Sheet	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	-
2. Debarment Certification Form	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	-
3. Abstract	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	-
4. Program Demographics	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	-
5. Partners	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	-

Section II. Specifications of Work to Be Performed (55 Total Points)

Planning (Maximum 4 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
Description of the planning process used to submit the application	2	2
Planning meetings and collaborative writing sessions, including multiple parties	2	1
Need for Program (Maximum 6 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
Evaluation of community needs and available resources for the community learning center(s)	3	3
Description of how proposed program will address the identified community needs, in particular the needs of (primarily low-performing) students and working families	3	2
Program Design (Maximum 25 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
Range and type of program activities that will be offered and how those activities will improve student academic achievement and overall student success and align with the academic goals in Appendix D	2	1
Number of students and low-performing students that will be served at each site, grade-levels, average daily attendance	3	3
General schedule of operations for each proposed site is provided; the number of program days/hours are included and meet program minimums outlined in Appendix G	3	3
Staffing ratios alignment with the recommended instructor to student ratios outlined in Appendix G	2	2

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION & NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: LearningWorks (Biddeford Public Schools)
DATE: 05/31/24

<p>Elements of high-quality programming:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Linkages to School Day • Strong Instructional Leadership • Safe and Appropriate Environment • Student-Driven Programming • Regular Attendees 	5	5
<p>All six (6) of the program goals for the 21st CCLC program have been addressed within Appendix D and include the necessary strategies, activities, and proposed outcomes in the areas of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Academic Improvement • Health and Wellness • Educational Enrichment • Parent Education and Family Engagement • Sustainability and Collaboration • Professional and Staff Development 	6	5
<p>All proposed outcomes in Appendix D match the required performance measures (percentages, numbers, frequencies, etc. are provided where requested) and appear realistic, given size and scope of the proposal</p>	4	4
Program Management (Maximum 10 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
<p>Elements of program management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program Leadership • School Leadership Support • Staff and Professional Development • Communication/Information Dissemination • Transportation • Volunteers 	10	9
Program Evaluation (Maximum 10 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
<p>Description of how the program(s) will be based on the following “measures of effectiveness”:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. be based upon an assessment of objective data regarding the need for before and after school (or summer recess) programs and activities in the schools and communities; ii. be based upon an established set of performance measures aimed at ensuring the availability of high-quality academic enrichment programs; iii. if appropriate, be based upon evidence-based research that the program or activity will help students meet the challenging State academic standards and any local academic standards; iv. ensure that measures of student success align with the regular academic program of the school and academic needs of participating students and include performance indicators and measures as determined by the state; and v. collect the data necessary for the measures of student success described in subparagraph (iv) above. 	4	3
<p>Periodic evaluation to assess the providers progress toward its goal of providing high-quality opportunities for academic enrichment</p>	3	3
<p>Results of a periodic evaluation of the proposed program will refine, improve, and strengthen the program and its performance measures as well as how and when the results of periodic evaluations will be made available to the public and used to build community support.</p>	3	3
Section II Total (Max. 55 Points)		49

Section III. Budget Proposal (38 Total Points)

Budget Narrative and Budget Forms (Maximum 25 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
<p>Budget Narrative describes how items within the budget will support the achievement of program goals and performance measures outlined in Appendix D</p>	4	4
<p>Budget Narrative aligns with and provides an explanation of content in the budget forms</p>	3	2

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION & NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: LearningWorks (Biddeford Public Schools)
DATE: 05/31/24

Items are addressed within the Budget Narrative: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Estimated cost per regular, low-performing student • Evidence is provided that there is a commitment of adequate resources for all participants • Fee structure is described, if applicable • Federal, State, and local program resources • Purpose of all expenditures has been described • In-kind contributions from partners that demonstrate the capacity to sustain programming 	6	5
Budget Forms – 001, 002, 003, 004, and 005: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are complete and align with the budget narrative • Illustrate that program transportation costs are shared, with the local school district contributing at least 35% of the overall annual transportation cost • Provide evidence that the requested amount is appropriate and reasonable for the size and scope of the project (most funds going towards expenses directly impacting programming for students) • Provide detailed line-item descriptions (e.g., hours worked per week, rate of pay, weeks per year) • Demonstrate a detailed and logical connection to program goals 	12	11
Capacity for Success and Sustainability (Maximum 13 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
Program advisory board member information has been provided and represents a diverse group of stakeholders	4	4
Sustainability plan, which describes how the community learning center(s) included within the proposal will continue to operate without 21 st CCLC program funding after the anticipated award period ends	5	3
Roles and commitment of key partners, including involvement with program design and implementation	4	4
Section III Total (Max. 38 points)		33

Section IV. Priority Points (7 Total Points)

Priority Points (Maximum 7 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
<u>Poverty Level:</u>		
Percentage of school population eligible for free and reduced-price lunch	Less than 45%	Between 45% and 59%
	Between 60% and 75%	Greater than 75%
Point Scale	0 Points	1 Point
	2 Points	3 Points
<u>ESEA Accountability Status:</u>		
ESEA accountability status of the school(s) included within the application	No school(s) eligible for “Tier 1”, “Tier 2”, or “Tier 3” support	One or more schools eligible for “Tier 1” or “Tier 2” support
	One or more schools eligible for “Tier 3” support	
Priority points	0 Points	1 Point
	2 Points	
<u>Other Need:</u>		
Level of evidence within the application	No Evidence	Moderate Evidence
	High Evidence	
Priority points	0 Points	1 Point
	2 Points	
Section V Total (Max. 7 points)		3
OFFICIAL SCORE (Max. 100 points)		85

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION & NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: LearningWorks (Biddeford Public Schools)
DATE: 05/31/24

EVALUATION TEAM NOTES

Section II. Specifications of Work to be Performed	Points Possible: 55	Score: <u>49</u>
---	----------------------------	-------------------------

Evaluation Team Comments:

The overall planning process included a good mix of internal staff and external partners. However, it was not always clear what organization different partners represented. The proposal noted that there were several stakeholders involved in the planning process over the course of the development of the proposal. However, the team noted planning time felt minimal with only 9 hours of total planning time.

The case for the program is well-documented throughout the needs assessment, with several different data points used to demonstrate need (Student academic, poverty, SNAP/TANF, etc. data). Bidder also noted increases in student behavioral issues that would be addressed through the delivery of 21st CCLC programming. The review team has questioned how the resulting program would ultimately address the needs of students—particularly the needs of English language learners.

Specific intervention programs that will be used to support overall improvements in student academic achievement. The general schedule of operations for school year and summer programs meets the minimum requirements of the RFP. The review team wondered whether the bidder has planned any targeted programming or interventions for the Pre-K students, as their learning needs would likely be different than older students. Staff-to-student ratios are 1:8 for all activity types, which meets the requirements of the RFP.

The program has strong linkages to the school day, with the SAU referring students to the 21st CCLC program based on academic needs. The bidder’s plan for recruiting and hiring qualified staff was well developed. The use of volunteers to support the program seemed limited. The York County Community Action Head Start partnership could be explored further to help develop specific programming and interventions for the Pre-K student population. The bidder made note of reaching out to families regarding the importance of regular student participation in the 21st CCLC program as well as other strategies to encourage regular student participation.

The proposed strategies and activities for the academic goals in Appendix D did not appear to be evidence-based and it appeared as though the strategies presented may not be entirely appropriate for the Pre-K student population to be served. The review team questioned why some of the responses in Appendix D seemed to be more general/global as opposed to specific to the students and schools to be supported through the resulting program. The STEAM strategies and activities presented were robust and included the use of the Boston Museum of Science curriculum. The review team appreciated the inclusion of translation services for families but would’ve liked to see more robust cultural programming given the diversity of the students and families to be served by the program.

The bidder’s response speaks about the executive director for the bidder’s organization as well as two different Site Coordinators. The review team questioned whether the executive director would also be the program director for the proposed program. Staff and professional development plan were robust and included YPQA, NAA, and various other trainings. The communication plan was presented as a list of things that the program would be required to do but did not come across as a plan of when and how the work would actually be done. A strong process for the onboarding and vetting of volunteer staff was presented.

The bidder plans to conduct regularly and varied evaluations and produce program quality improvement plans for each site. The review team appreciated this iterative and ongoing approach to evaluation. However, the differentiation of data and services for the Pre-K – 2 student population was a concern. The evaluation work included a mix of both quantitative and qualitative data (YPQA, survey data, academic data, etc.). The Bidder notes the completion of an annual evaluation of the program and meeting with its advisory board to review the results of evaluation work to make adjustments where needed. This work is noted as being site-specific. However, the review team questioned how and when the results of evaluation work would be shared with other key stakeholders and build community support.

Section III. Budget Proposal	Points Possible: 38	Score: <u>33</u>
-------------------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------------

Evaluation Team Comments:

In general, the review team felt the budget narrative aligned with the goals presented in Appendix D. The proposal included serving 75 RLP students over the course of the year at a cost of \$2,697.78 per RLP student. The administrative costs are split between the bidder (\$1,338.00) and lead partner organization (\$33,076.00). The review team noted that the additional \$23,711.62 of “21st CCLC – second Biddeford grant” was not mentioned at all in the budget narrative. The proposal did not seem to include program fees at the moment, but the bidder did indicate the potential for fees to be charged in the future. It was unclear to the review team whether fees would be

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION & NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: LearningWorks (Biddeford Public Schools)
DATE: 05/31/24

charged or not. However, the bidder did indicate that no students would be turned away for inability to pay fees. Total transportation costs are \$33,760.23 with 35% of that cost (\$10,760.23) being contributed by the school district.

Overall, the budget forms were presented appropriately, and the costs included seemed reasonable. There were several in-kind contributions from partnering organizations. However, the review team noted that the funding from the bidding organization was minimal—roughly \$1,300 for the year. It was also concerning that line 16 on Budget Form 005 included \$5,400 for background checks and technology support. It was not clear to the review team what the breakdown of costs for these items were or what was included with the “technology support” expense(s). The team questioned whether these would be appropriate expenses to charge to a 21st CCLC grant award.

The program advisory board included 12 members spanning a wide array of stakeholder groups. The bidder appears to have been attentive to the cultural diversity of the area and has included the local DEI coordinator on their board. The preliminary sustainability plans for the program seem to be lacking student and parent voice and representation. Much of the information provided in the plan had to do with the bidding organization as a whole, as opposed to the plans for the specific 21st CCLC program being applied for. It was unclear to the review team whether the sustainability plan presented would actually serve to sustain the program beyond the life of a 21st CCLC grant award. The roles between the bidder and lead partner organization were well defined and it is noted that the SAU is providing support through a number of in-kind resources.

Section IV. Priority Points	Points Possible: 7	Score: <u>3</u>
------------------------------------	---------------------------	------------------------

Evaluation Team Comments:

The average free and reduced lunch rate of the school(s) included within the proposal totaled 50%.

No Tier 1, 2, or 3 schools have been included in the proposal.

Overall, the proposal provided a high level of evidence for other need, citing the local school district has the highest percentage of students receiving CDS services. There was also mention of a large multi-lingual learner student population as well as students receiving academic interventions. The Biddeford Ready study mentioned in the proposal also cited concerns around substance abuse, domestic violence, poverty, and incarceration in the Biddeford area.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION & NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: LearningWorks (Portland) (EE & R)
DATE: 05/31/24

Instructions: The purpose of this form is to record all evaluation notes and scoring that is obtained through consensus discussions among the full evaluation team for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. The RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator should complete this form and maintain the only copy. This form should reflect the full team's consensus evaluations, and this form is not meant to take the place of individual evaluation notes, which are still required from each member of the evaluation team. A separate form is available for individual evaluation notes. Please submit a copy of this document to the Division of Purchases as part of your contract award selection documents.

DEPARTMENT NAME: Education
NAME OF RFP COORDINATOR: Travis Doughty
NAMES OF EVALUATORS: Jessica Francis, Luba Greene, Rachelle Tome

POINT SUMMARY

Section I. General Information (Pass/Fail)

Required Item	Pass	Fail	Comments
1. Cover Sheet	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	-
2. Debarment Certification Form	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	-
3. Abstract	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	-
4. Program Demographics	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	-
5. Partners	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	-

Section II. Specifications of Work to Be Performed (55 Total Points)

Planning (Maximum 4 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
Description of the planning process used to submit the application	2	2
Planning meetings and collaborative writing sessions, including multiple parties	2	1
Need for Program (Maximum 6 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
Evaluation of community needs and available resources for the community learning center(s)	3	3
Description of how proposed program will address the identified community needs, in particular the needs of (primarily low-performing) students and working families	3	2
Program Design (Maximum 25 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
Range and type of program activities that will be offered and how those activities will improve student academic achievement and overall student success and align with the academic goals in Appendix D	2	1
Number of students and low-performing students that will be served at each site, grade-levels, average daily attendance	3	3
General schedule of operations for each proposed site is provided; the number of program days/hours are included and meet program minimums outlined in Appendix G	3	3
Staffing ratios alignment with the recommended instructor to student ratios outlined in Appendix G	2	1

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION & NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: LearningWorks (Portland) (EE & R)
DATE: 05/31/24

<p>Elements of high-quality programming:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Linkages to School Day • Strong Instructional Leadership • Safe and Appropriate Environment • Student-Driven Programming • Regular Attendees 	5	4
<p>All six (6) of the program goals for the 21st CCLC program have been addressed within Appendix D and include the necessary strategies, activities, and proposed outcomes in the areas of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Academic Improvement • Health and Wellness • Educational Enrichment • Parent Education and Family Engagement • Sustainability and Collaboration • Professional and Staff Development 	6	5
<p>All proposed outcomes in Appendix D match the required performance measures (percentages, numbers, frequencies, etc. are provided where requested) and appear realistic, given size and scope of the proposal</p>	4	4
<p>Program Management (Maximum 10 Points)</p>	Points Possible	Points Awarded
<p>Elements of program management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program Leadership • School Leadership Support • Staff and Professional Development • Communication/Information Dissemination • Transportation • Volunteers 	10	8
<p>Program Evaluation (Maximum 10 Points)</p>	Points Possible	Points Awarded
<p>Description of how the program(s) will be based on the following “measures of effectiveness”:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. be based upon an assessment of objective data regarding the need for before and after school (or summer recess) programs and activities in the schools and communities; ii. be based upon an established set of performance measures aimed at ensuring the availability of high-quality academic enrichment programs; iii. if appropriate, be based upon evidence-based research that the program or activity will help students meet the challenging State academic standards and any local academic standards; iv. ensure that measures of student success align with the regular academic program of the school and academic needs of participating students and include performance indicators and measures as determined by the state; and v. collect the data necessary for the measures of student success described in subparagraph (iv) above. 	4	4
<p>Periodic evaluation to assess the providers progress toward its goal of providing high-quality opportunities for academic enrichment</p>	3	3
<p>Results of a periodic evaluation of the proposed program will refine, improve, and strengthen the program and its performance measures as well as how and when the results of periodic evaluations will be made available to the public and used to build community support.</p>	3	3
Section II Total (Max. 55 Points)		47

Section III. Budget Proposal (38 Total Points)

<p>Budget Narrative and Budget Forms (Maximum 25 Points)</p>	Points Possible	Points Awarded
<p>Budget Narrative describes how items within the budget will support the achievement of program goals and performance measures outlined in Appendix D</p>	4	4
<p>Budget Narrative aligns with and provides an explanation of content in the budget forms</p>	3	2

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION & NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: LearningWorks (Portland) (EE & R)
DATE: 05/31/24

Items are addressed within the Budget Narrative: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Estimated cost per regular, low-performing student • Evidence is provided that there is a commitment of adequate resources for all participants • Fee structure is described, if applicable • Federal, State, and local program resources • Purpose of all expenditures has been described • In-kind contributions from partners that demonstrate the capacity to sustain programming 	6	5
Budget Forms – 001, 002, 003, 004, and 005: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are complete and align with the budget narrative • Illustrate that program transportation costs are shared, with the local school district contributing at least 35% of the overall annual transportation cost • Provide evidence that the requested amount is appropriate and reasonable for the size and scope of the project (most funds going towards expenses directly impacting programming for students) • Provide detailed line-item descriptions (e.g., hours worked per week, rate of pay, weeks per year) • Demonstrate a detailed and logical connection to program goals 	12	11
Capacity for Success and Sustainability (Maximum 13 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
Program advisory board member information has been provided and represents a diverse group of stakeholders	4	3
Sustainability plan, which describes how the community learning center(s) included within the proposal will continue to operate without 21 st CCLC program funding after the anticipated award period ends	5	3
Roles and commitment of key partners, including involvement with program design and implementation	4	4
Section III Total (Max. 38 points)		32

Section IV. Priority Points (7 Total Points)

Priority Points (Maximum 7 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
<u>Poverty Level:</u>		
Percentage of school population eligible for free and reduced-price lunch	Less than 45%	Between 45% and 59%
	Between 60% and 75%	Greater than 75%
Point Scale	0 Points	1 Point
	2 Points	3 Points
	3	2
<u>ESEA Accountability Status:</u>		
ESEA accountability status of the school(s) included within the application	No school(s) eligible for “Tier 1”, “Tier 2”, or “Tier 3” support	One or more schools eligible for “Tier 1” or “Tier 2” support
	One or more schools eligible for “Tier 3” support	
Priority points	0 Points	1 Point
	2 Points	2 Points
	2	0
<u>Other Need:</u>		
Level of evidence within the application	No Evidence	Moderate Evidence
	High Evidence	
Priority points	0 Points	1 Point
	2 Points	2 Points
	2	2
Section V Total (Max. 7 points)		4
OFFICIAL SCORE (Max. 100 points)		83

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION & NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: LearningWorks (Portland) (EE & R)
DATE: 05/31/24

EVALUATION TEAM NOTES

Section II. Specifications of Work to be Performed	Points Possible: 55	Score: <u>47</u>
<p>Evaluation Team Comments:</p> <p>The overall planning process included a mix of internal staff and external partners representing multiple stakeholder groups. However, it was not always clear what organization different partners represented. Much of the work appeared collaborative in nature between various organizations. The planning process began in December and went through April, totaling 21 hours of planning time.</p> <p>The needs assessment noted high levels of poverty at both schools as well as high levels of black, indigenous, and people of color (BIPOC) students attending the schools served. Over 50% of the students to be served are also multi-lingual learners (MLs) with similarly high rates of immigrant families transitioning to life in the greater Portland area. There is also a high rate of students needing additional academic support and interventions. While other after-school programs exist in the area, many are not free or affordable for the families in need. There is a great breadth of information provided regarding community need; however, the bidder did not really speak to how those needs would be addressed through its proposed 21st CCLC program.</p> <p>The program design offers targeted academic intervention for students, which is largely STEM-focused and based on the Boston Museum of Science curriculum. For a program with a large multi-lingual learner population, the review team questioned whether there were more specific, targeted interventions planned for those students—particularly around the language acquisition skills necessary to fully engage in the program. Overall, the responses provided here felt more “global” or high-level and less specific to the schools and student populations to be served. Both school year and summer instructional hours meet and exceed the minimum requirements of the RFP. However, staff to student ratios are noted as 1:10 across the board, which does not meet the RFP requirements around targeted academic support noted in Appendix G of the RFP.</p> <p>There’s a strong linkage to school day programming, with a variety of school personnel often referring students to the 21st CCLC program. That said, the review team would’ve liked to see stronger, more purposeful strategies to help meet the needs of ML students. School day teachers and educational technicians are prioritized as part of the program’s hiring process. The program is set up to use interpreters to ensure it is able to communicate effectively with all families—particularly if students have not been attending the program regularly enough to benefit from services.</p> <p>In Appendix D of the proposal, the strategies and activities presented are well defined. However, the review team questioned the extent to which the academic goals presented would be achievable—especially without having baseline data on student performance provided earlier in the proposal. The responses provided seemed a bit lacking in this area. The proposal included STEAM programming twice a week using the Boston Museum of Science curriculum. There was also mention of the needs and considerations of ML students, with family engagement and education including multiple events, communications, and interpretation services. This was a nice addition that seemed to be missing from earlier portions of the proposal.</p> <p>The program has an existing director and associate director as well as plans to have two site coordinators—one for each of the proposed program sites. The review team questioned why the proposed program would need two program administrators for a program that serves roughly 60 RLP students annually. The narrative provided was not clear as to what aspects of the work would warrant funding for an associate director position. The review team also found it odd that the bidder provided information here about its executive director. The transportation plans seem adequate to meet the needs of students and families. In terms of communication plan, it seems like the bidder covered all stakeholder groups except for the larger school community.</p> <p>The program intends to conduct an annual evaluation of the program, citing YPQA, NWEA, and report card data. The narrative provided noted the use of a Program Quality Improvement Plans that each site would regularly review. Evaluation results are shared with advisory board members and administrators, but it is unclear how or if this information would be shared with other stakeholders. Overall, this section of the proposal seemed more “big picture” and general in nature and did not provide the level of specific detail that would be expected by the review team.</p>		
Section III. Budget Proposal	Points Possible: 38	Score: <u>32</u>
<p>Evaluation Team Comments:</p>		

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION & NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: LearningWorks (Portland) (EE & R)
DATE: 05/31/24

In general, the review team felt the budget narrative aligned with the goals presented in Appendix D. The proposed program intends to serve 60 RLP students annually, at a cost of \$2,700 per RLP student. Overall administrative costs are supported by both the bidder (\$6,297.00) and lead partner organization (\$25,401). The review team noted that the additional \$99,864.00 of "21st CCLC – additional grants" were not mentioned at all in the budget narrative. The proposal did not seem to include program fees at the moment, but the bidder did indicate the potential for fees to be charged in the future. It was unclear to the review team whether fees would be charged or not. However, the bidder did indicate that no students would be turned away for inability to pay fees. The budget narrative noted that 35% of transportation costs would be contributed by the partnering school district, but the bidder did not specify what that percentage would amount to for funding.

According to the budget forms, the program's transportation budget totals \$11,000 with \$5,923.08 coming from the school district, which meets the 35% requirement in the RFP. For the size of the program (roughly 60 RLP students), the review team felt the budget was a bit heavy on administrator positions. It was unclear why both a program director and assistant director are needed to carry out this program. It was also concerning that line 16 on Budget Form 005 included \$3,000 for background checks and technology support. It was not clear to the review team what the breakdown of costs for these items were or what was included with the "technology support" expense(s). It was also unclear whether these would be allowable expenses to charge to a 21st CCLC grant award.

The program advisory board was robust with nearly 20 individual members. It is noted, however, that the board seemed a bit heavy on members from the school district as compared to other partners. The review team also noted that the parent representative on the board was representing a different school than the ones targeted in the proposal. The sustainability plan provided within the proposal included some work that the bidder organization already does to raise funding. However, it did not provide a great deal of specifics for how the bidder would continue to operate the proposed program after the funding period for the grant award would have ended. The roles of the bidding organization and lead partner organization were well-defined.

Section IV. Priority Points		
	Points Possible: 7	Score: <u>4</u>

Evaluation Team Comments:

The average free and reduced lunch rate of the school(s) included within the proposal totaled 64%.

No Tier 1, 2, or 3 schools have been included in the proposal.

Overall, the proposal provided a high level of evidence for other need, citing roughly 65% poverty level in the communities served, 53% BIPOC students and over 40% ML students in both schools. Additionally, Portland Public Schools is noted as having 11% of the state's McKinney-Vento eligible students (i.e. student experiencing homelessness).

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION & NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: LearningWorks (Portland) (OA & P)
DATE: 05/08/24

Instructions: The purpose of this form is to record all evaluation notes and scoring that is obtained through consensus discussions among the full evaluation team for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. The RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator should complete this form and maintain the only copy. This form should reflect the full team's consensus evaluations, and this form is not meant to take the place of individual evaluation notes, which are still required from each member of the evaluation team. A separate form is available for individual evaluation notes. Please submit a copy of this document to the Division of Purchases as part of your contract award selection documents.

DEPARTMENT NAME: Education
NAME OF RFP COORDINATOR: Travis Doughty
NAMES OF EVALUATORS: Jessica Francis, Luba Greene, Rachelle Tome

POINT SUMMARY

Section I. General Information (Pass/Fail)

Required Item	Pass	Fail	Comments
1. Cover Sheet	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	-
2. Debarment Certification Form	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	-
3. Abstract	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	-
4. Program Demographics	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	-
5. Partners	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	-

Section II. Specifications of Work to Be Performed (55 Total Points)

Planning (Maximum 4 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
Description of the planning process used to submit the application	2	2
Planning meetings and collaborative writing sessions, including multiple parties	2	1
Need for Program (Maximum 6 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
Evaluation of community needs and available resources for the community learning center(s)	3	3
Description of how proposed program will address the identified community needs, in particular the needs of (primarily low-performing) students and working families	3	1
Program Design (Maximum 25 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
Range and type of program activities that will be offered and how those activities will improve student academic achievement and overall student success and align with the academic goals in Appendix D	2	1
Number of students and low-performing students that will be served at each site, grade-levels, average daily attendance	3	2
General schedule of operations for each proposed site is provided; the number of program days/hours are included and meet program minimums outlined in Appendix G	3	3
Staffing ratios alignment with the recommended instructor to student ratios outlined in Appendix G	2	1

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION & NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: LearningWorks (Portland) (OA & P)
DATE: 05/08/24

<p>Elements of high-quality programming:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Linkages to School Day • Strong Instructional Leadership • Safe and Appropriate Environment • Student-Driven Programming • Regular Attendees 	5	4
<p>All six (6) of the program goals for the 21st CCLC program have been addressed within Appendix D and include the necessary strategies, activities, and proposed outcomes in the areas of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Academic Improvement • Health and Wellness • Educational Enrichment • Parent Education and Family Engagement • Sustainability and Collaboration • Professional and Staff Development 	6	6
<p>All proposed outcomes in Appendix D match the required performance measures (percentages, numbers, frequencies, etc. are provided where requested) and appear realistic, given size and scope of the proposal</p>	4	4
Program Management (Maximum 10 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
<p>Elements of program management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program Leadership • School Leadership Support • Staff and Professional Development • Communication/Information Dissemination • Transportation • Volunteers 	10	9
Program Evaluation (Maximum 10 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
<p>Description of how the program(s) will be based on the following “measures of effectiveness”:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. be based upon an assessment of objective data regarding the need for before and after school (or summer recess) programs and activities in the schools and communities; ii. be based upon an established set of performance measures aimed at ensuring the availability of high-quality academic enrichment programs; iii. if appropriate, be based upon evidence-based research that the program or activity will help students meet the challenging State academic standards and any local academic standards; iv. ensure that measures of student success align with the regular academic program of the school and academic needs of participating students and include performance indicators and measures as determined by the state; and v. collect the data necessary for the measures of student success described in subparagraph (iv) above. 	4	4
<p>Periodic evaluation to assess the providers progress toward its goal of providing high-quality opportunities for academic enrichment</p>	3	3
<p>Results of a periodic evaluation of the proposed program will refine, improve, and strengthen the program and its performance measures as well as how and when the results of periodic evaluations will be made available to the public and used to build community support.</p>	3	3
Section II Total (Max. 55 Points)		47

Section III. Budget Proposal (38 Total Points)

Budget Narrative and Budget Forms (Maximum 25 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
<p>Budget Narrative describes how items within the budget will support the achievement of program goals and performance measures outlined in Appendix D</p>	4	4
<p>Budget Narrative aligns with and provides an explanation of content in the budget forms</p>	3	2

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION & NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: LearningWorks (Portland) (OA & P)
DATE: 05/08/24

Items are addressed within the Budget Narrative: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Estimated cost per regular, low-performing student • Evidence is provided that there is a commitment of adequate resources for all participants • Fee structure is described, if applicable • Federal, State, and local program resources • Purpose of all expenditures has been described • In-kind contributions from partners that demonstrate the capacity to sustain programming 	6	5
Budget Forms – 001, 002, 003, 004, and 005: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are complete and align with the budget narrative • Illustrate that program transportation costs are shared, with the local school district contributing at least 35% of the overall annual transportation cost • Provide evidence that the requested amount is appropriate and reasonable for the size and scope of the project (most funds going towards expenses directly impacting programming for students) • Provide detailed line-item descriptions (e.g., hours worked per week, rate of pay, weeks per year) • Demonstrate a detailed and logical connection to program goals 	12	11
Capacity for Success and Sustainability (Maximum 13 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
Program advisory board member information has been provided and represents a diverse group of stakeholders	4	4
Sustainability plan, which describes how the community learning center(s) included within the proposal will continue to operate without 21 st CCLC program funding after the anticipated award period ends	5	3
Roles and commitment of key partners, including involvement with program design and implementation	4	4
Section III Total (Max. 38 points)		33

Section IV. Priority Points (7 Total Points)

Priority Points (Maximum 7 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
<u>Poverty Level:</u>		
Percentage of school population eligible for free and reduced-price lunch	Less than 45%	Between 45% and 59%
	Between 60% and 75%	Greater than 75%
Point Scale	0 Points	1 Point
	2 Points	3 Points
<u>ESEA Accountability Status:</u>		
ESEA accountability status of the school(s) included within the application	No school(s) eligible for “Tier 1”, “Tier 2”, or “Tier 3” support	One or more schools eligible for “Tier 1” or “Tier 2” support
	One or more schools eligible for “Tier 3” support	
Priority points	0 Points	1 Point
	2 Points	
<u>Other Need:</u>		
Level of evidence within the application	No Evidence	Moderate Evidence
	High Evidence	
Priority points	0 Points	1 Point
	2 Points	
Section V Total (Max. 7 points)		2
OFFICIAL SCORE (Max. 100 points)		82

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION & NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: LearningWorks (Portland) (OA & P)
DATE: 05/08/24

EVALUATION TEAM NOTES

Section II. Specifications of Work to be Performed	Points Possible: 55	Score: <u>47</u>
<p>Evaluation Team Comments:</p> <p>The overall planning process spanned from December through April, with several writing sessions and planning meetings. That said, individual participants for these sessions are not listed, making it difficult to determine which individuals and organizations were represented during the planning process. From what the review team was able to discern, it appeared as though representation from the bidding organization was heavy in the overall planning process. The narrative for the planning process mentioned other schools that were not included in the proposal, which the review team found concerning.</p> <p>The two schools targeted in the application are Title I schools with high numbers of multi-lingual learners (MLs) and black, indigenous, and people of color (BIPOC) students. The data provided seemed to focus on the greater Portland community and while the response did include reference to students performing below grade level expectations, there wasn't much in terms of how the proposed program would serve to address those challenges. It is also noted that the narrative indicated there are no alternative programs in the schools proposed to be served that are free of charge. Overall, the response here could have been made stronger by providing more specific data and plans related to the individual schools targeted in this proposal.</p> <p>The program intends to use a STEAM program modeled after the Boston Museum of Science curriculum. It was also noted by the review team that the program design is largely focused on STEAM content and did not make strong reference to other areas important for comprehensive programming (health & wellness, arts, nutrition, etc.). The review team also questioned how the program design would support the needs of ML students, as this need was expressed earlier in the proposal. The team appreciated the mention of opportunities for students to have voice and choice in the program's planning process but were confused by the lack of information on how this process would be carried out locally. The number of RLP students to be served seemed low in comparison to the eligible student population for both schools, with less than 1/3 of the eligible students reaching RLP status. The school year and summer operational schedules meet and exceed the minimum requirements set forth in the RFP. The staff-to-student ratios meet some but not all of the requirements of Appendix G of the RFP. For tutoring specifically, the ratios should be no more than 1 certified teacher to every 8 students. However, the bidder's response includes a ratio of 1:10 in this area.</p> <p>There is a shared ownership of student learning between the bidding organization and partnering school districts. That said, the review team would've liked to see stronger, more purposeful strategies to help meet the needs of ML students. The bidder provided a strong response around student safety and included information around SEL practices. There is also mention of programs and activities being experiential, multi-modal, and differentiated to better meet the needs of individual students. The proposal also included sound strategies for encouraging regular attendance of students, including the provision of transportation services and regularly communicating with parents.</p> <p>In Appendix D of the proposal, the bidder's goals struck a good balance of both rigor and reasonableness. The strategies and activities presented throughout this portion of the proposal are well defined. The review team felt that the academic goals presented were achievable. The strategies and activities presented included addressing behavior expectations and SEL. The family engagement section of Appendix D included specific attention to the needs of multi-lingual families. This was a nice addition, as the team felt this sort of information was missing from earlier parts of the proposal.</p> <p>The bidder's response provided information on the background and experience of their proposed program director. However, some specifics about the position, such as weekly hours, were not provided. The review team also found it odd that the bidder provided information here about its executive director instead of focusing more on further describing the requirements and plans of its proposed 21st CCLC program director position. The response provided around support from school leadership was a bit vague, noting only that school leaders would serve as the conduit to communication with teachers and other school staff. The review team wondered when and if more intentional collaborative time between the bidding organization and school leaders would occur. The review team appreciated the opportunity for translation services for those in need in terms of the program's communication plan.</p> <p>The bidder plans to conduct regularly and varied evaluations and produce program quality improvement plans for each site. The review team appreciated this iterative and ongoing approach to evaluation. The evaluation work included a mix of both quantitative and qualitative data (YPQA, survey data, academic data, etc.). The bidder plans to share the findings of its evaluation work results with its advisory board once a year.</p>		

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION & NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: LearningWorks (Portland) (OA & P)
DATE: 05/08/24

Section III. Budget Proposal	Points Possible: 38	Score: <u>33</u>
<p>Evaluation Team Comments:</p> <p>In general, the review team felt the budget narrative aligned with the goals presented in Appendix D. The budget narrative notes that 60 RLP students would be served at a cost of \$2,700.00 per RLP student. The review team noted that the additional \$99,864.00 of “21st CCLC – additional grants” were not mentioned at all in the budget narrative. The proposal indicated that there are currently no fees charged to students or families to participate in the program. However, the review team noted the narrative indicated additional plans, “if fees become necessary”. It was unclear whether the bidder would consider charging program fees under this proposal or under what circumstances it may decide to do so. If fees are being considered as part of this proposal, the review team would like to have seen a potential fee structure to ensure that what the bidder may be considering would be appropriate within the requirements of the 21st CCLC program.</p> <p>The partnering school district is providing the minimum 35% contribution (\$5,923.08) to the program’s annual transportation budget (\$16,923.08). On Form 003, the review team questioned the need for two full-time program directors (director and associate director) for a program serving two schools. It seemed like the administrative costs included in the proposal might be more than is really required for the proposed program.</p> <p>The program advisory board has 20 members and includes representation from school leadership, parents, and other community partners. The sustainability plan presented included the further development of additional partnerships with outside agencies. However, much of the information provided in the plan had to do with the bidding organization as a whole, as opposed to the plans for the specific 21st CCLC program being applied for. The overall roles and commitments between the bidder and partnering school district were well defined, though the review team would have liked to see more specifics about the individual schools being served by the grant.</p>		
Section IV. Priority Points	Points Possible: 7	Score: <u>2</u>
<p>Evaluation Team Comments:</p> <p>The average free and reduced lunch rate of the school(s) included within the proposal totaled 44%.</p> <p>One or more Tier 1 schools have been included in the proposal.</p> <p>Overall, the proposal provided a moderate level of evidence for other need, citing high poverty and lack of alternative affordable after-school programming in the communities to be served. There is evidence of a high rate of ML students and immigrant families in the communities to be served. The proposal also notes issues of student homelessness.</p>		

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION & NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: LearningWorks (RSU 57)
DATE: 05/09/24

Instructions: The purpose of this form is to record all evaluation notes and scoring that is obtained through consensus discussions among the full evaluation team for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. The RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator should complete this form and maintain the only copy. This form should reflect the full team's consensus evaluations, and this form is not meant to take the place of individual evaluation notes, which are still required from each member of the evaluation team. A separate form is available for individual evaluation notes. Please submit a copy of this document to the Division of Purchases as part of your contract award selection documents.

DEPARTMENT NAME: Education
NAME OF RFP COORDINATOR: Travis Doughty
NAMES OF EVALUATORS: Jessica Francis, Luba Greene, Rachelle Tome

POINT SUMMARY

Section I. General Information (Pass/Fail)

Required Item	Pass	Fail	Comments
1. Cover Sheet	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	-
2. Debarment Certification Form	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	-
3. Abstract	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	-
4. Program Demographics	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	-
5. Partners	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	-

Section II. Specifications of Work to Be Performed (55 Total Points)

Planning (Maximum 4 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
Description of the planning process used to submit the application	2	2
Planning meetings and collaborative writing sessions, including multiple parties	2	1
Need for Program (Maximum 6 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
Evaluation of community needs and available resources for the community learning center(s)	3	2
Description of how proposed program will address the identified community needs, in particular the needs of (primarily low-performing) students and working families	3	3
Program Design (Maximum 25 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
Range and type of program activities that will be offered and how those activities will improve student academic achievement and overall student success and align with the academic goals in Appendix D	2	1
Number of students and low-performing students that will be served at each site, grade-levels, average daily attendance	3	3
General schedule of operations for each proposed site is provided; the number of program days/hours are included and meet program minimums outlined in Appendix G	3	3
Staffing ratios alignment with the recommended instructor to student ratios outlined in Appendix G	2	2

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION & NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: LearningWorks (RSU 57)
DATE: 05/09/24

Elements of high-quality programming: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Linkages to School Day • Strong Instructional Leadership • Safe and Appropriate Environment • Student-Driven Programming • Regular Attendees 	5	5
All six (6) of the program goals for the 21 st CCLC program have been addressed within Appendix D and include the necessary strategies, activities, and proposed outcomes in the areas of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Academic Improvement • Health and Wellness • Educational Enrichment • Parent Education and Family Engagement • Sustainability and Collaboration • Professional and Staff Development 	6	6
All proposed outcomes in Appendix D match the required performance measures (percentages, numbers, frequencies, etc. are provided where requested) and appear realistic, given size and scope of the proposal	4	4
Program Management (Maximum 10 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
Elements of program management: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program Leadership • School Leadership Support • Staff and Professional Development • Communication/Information Dissemination • Transportation • Volunteers 	10	10
Program Evaluation (Maximum 10 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
Description of how the program(s) will be based on the following “measures of effectiveness”: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. be based upon an assessment of objective data regarding the need for before and after school (or summer recess) programs and activities in the schools and communities; ii. be based upon an established set of performance measures aimed at ensuring the availability of high-quality academic enrichment programs; iii. if appropriate, be based upon evidence-based research that the program or activity will help students meet the challenging State academic standards and any local academic standards; iv. ensure that measures of student success align with the regular academic program of the school and academic needs of participating students and include performance indicators and measures as determined by the state; and v. collect the data necessary for the measures of student success described in subparagraph (iv) above. 	4	4
Periodic evaluation to assess the providers progress toward its goal of providing high-quality opportunities for academic enrichment	3	3
Results of a periodic evaluation of the proposed program will refine, improve, and strengthen the program and its performance measures as well as how and when the results of periodic evaluations will be made available to the public and used to build community support.	3	3
Section II Total (Max. 55 Points)		52

Section III. Budget Proposal (38 Total Points)

Budget Narrative and Budget Forms (Maximum 25 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
Budget Narrative describes how items within the budget will support the achievement of program goals and performance measures outlined in Appendix D	4	4
Budget Narrative aligns with and provides an explanation of content in the budget forms	3	2

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION & NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: LearningWorks (RSU 57)
DATE: 05/09/24

Items are addressed within the Budget Narrative: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Estimated cost per regular, low-performing student • Evidence is provided that there is a commitment of adequate resources for all participants • Fee structure is described, if applicable • Federal, State, and local program resources • Purpose of all expenditures has been described • In-kind contributions from partners that demonstrate the capacity to sustain programming 	6	5
Budget Forms – 001, 002, 003, 004, and 005: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are complete and align with the budget narrative • Illustrate that program transportation costs are shared, with the local school district contributing at least 35% of the overall annual transportation cost • Provide evidence that the requested amount is appropriate and reasonable for the size and scope of the project (most funds going towards expenses directly impacting programming for students) • Provide detailed line-item descriptions (e.g., hours worked per week, rate of pay, weeks per year) • Demonstrate a detailed and logical connection to program goals 	12	9
Capacity for Success and Sustainability (Maximum 13 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
Program advisory board member information has been provided and represents a diverse group of stakeholders	4	3
Sustainability plan, which describes how the community learning center(s) included within the proposal will continue to operate without 21 st CCLC program funding after the anticipated award period ends	5	3
Roles and commitment of key partners, including involvement with program design and implementation	4	4
Section III Total (Max. 38 points)		30

Section IV. Priority Points (7 Total Points)

Priority Points (Maximum 7 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded										
<u>Poverty Level:</u>												
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 30%;">Percentage of school population eligible for free and reduced-price lunch</td> <td style="width: 15%;">Less than 45%</td> <td style="width: 15%;">Between 45% and 59%</td> <td style="width: 15%;">Between 60% and 75%</td> <td style="width: 25%;">Greater than 75%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Point Scale</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0 Points</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1 Point</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2 Points</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3 Points</td> </tr> </table>	Percentage of school population eligible for free and reduced-price lunch	Less than 45%	Between 45% and 59%	Between 60% and 75%	Greater than 75%	Point Scale	0 Points	1 Point	2 Points	3 Points	3	0
Percentage of school population eligible for free and reduced-price lunch	Less than 45%	Between 45% and 59%	Between 60% and 75%	Greater than 75%								
Point Scale	0 Points	1 Point	2 Points	3 Points								
<u>ESEA Accountability Status:</u>												
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 30%;">ESEA accountability status of the school(s) included within the application</td> <td style="width: 15%;">No school(s) eligible for “Tier 1”, “Tier 2”, or “Tier 3” support</td> <td style="width: 15%;">One or more schools eligible for “Tier 1” or “Tier 2” support</td> <td style="width: 40%;">One or more schools eligible for “Tier 3” support</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Priority points</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0 Points</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1 Point</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2 Points</td> </tr> </table>	ESEA accountability status of the school(s) included within the application	No school(s) eligible for “Tier 1”, “Tier 2”, or “Tier 3” support	One or more schools eligible for “Tier 1” or “Tier 2” support	One or more schools eligible for “Tier 3” support	Priority points	0 Points	1 Point	2 Points	2	1		
ESEA accountability status of the school(s) included within the application	No school(s) eligible for “Tier 1”, “Tier 2”, or “Tier 3” support	One or more schools eligible for “Tier 1” or “Tier 2” support	One or more schools eligible for “Tier 3” support									
Priority points	0 Points	1 Point	2 Points									
<u>Other Need:</u>												
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 30%;">Level of evidence within the application</td> <td style="width: 20%;">No Evidence</td> <td style="width: 20%;">Moderate Evidence</td> <td style="width: 30%;">High Evidence</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Priority points</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0 Points</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1 Point</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2 Points</td> </tr> </table>	Level of evidence within the application	No Evidence	Moderate Evidence	High Evidence	Priority points	0 Points	1 Point	2 Points	2	0		
Level of evidence within the application	No Evidence	Moderate Evidence	High Evidence									
Priority points	0 Points	1 Point	2 Points									
Section V Total (Max. 7 points)		1										
OFFICIAL SCORE (Max. 100 points)		83										

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION & NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: LearningWorks (RSU 57)
DATE: 05/09/24

EVALUATION TEAM NOTES

Section II. Specifications of Work to be Performed	Points Possible: 55	Score: <u>52</u>
---	----------------------------	-------------------------

Evaluation Team Comments:

The overall planning process spanned from December to March for a total of 9 hours of planning time. The review team did not see the inclusion of any parents or students in the planning process and would've liked to see more involvement from school administration. Overall, it seemed those individuals who engaged in the planning process were mostly bidder staff, with minimal involvement of partners.

The needs assessment portion of the proposal included largely generalized information for the communities that would be served by the program. The bidder notes the program being located in a rural area with economic challenges for many students and families. It was noted that there are limited alternative program options in the area which are more expensive and do not include academic programming. The narrative provided did a nice job of articulating how the needs that were identified would be addressed through the delivery of the proposed program—covering both academic and SEL support for students.

The review team questioned the language included in the proposal that stated the bidder's program is regarded as one of RSU 57's most robust OST programs. It was unclear whether the school district has access to other afterschool programming or where the proposed program might fit into the mix of afterschool programs available to the school district. The program is noted as focusing on project-based STEAM programming based upon the Boston Museum of Science curriculum. The review team noted the program design is heavily focused on STEAM, with limited programming in other important areas (health and wellness, art, etc.). The bidder plans to prioritize hiring school district staff to work in the program. The number of students and RLP students to be served seems reasonable given the requested amount for the proposal. The school year and summer hour instructional hours meet the minimum requirements set forth in the RFP. Additionally, the staff-to-student ratios presented align with the requirements in Appendix G.

There appears to be a shared ownership of student learning between the bidding organization and partnering school district. The bidder provided a strong response around student safety and included SEL practices as part of their response. There is mention of programs and activities being experiential, multi-modal, and differentiated in order to better meet the needs of individual students. The proposal also included sound strategies for encouraging regular attendance of students, including the provision of transportation services and regularly communicating with parents. The review team also appreciated the fact that students will have autonomy, voice, and choice in the overall planning process for program activities.

Overall, the goals presented in Appendix D seemed reasonable and the bidder did a good job of balancing rigor with what is realistically achievable. The strategies and activities presented in this section of the proposal were well-defined throughout all six goal areas. The goals for parental involvement are noted as being positive, including multiple avenues for communication with parents as well as translation services to ensure that all parents have equal opportunity to engage with the program. Overall, the review team felt this portion of the proposal was well-developed and provided sound strategies and activities to help the program achieve its goals.

The response provided around program leadership indicated the program will have an individual serving a dual role of program director and site coordinator. The bidder already has someone in place to oversee the proposed program, who appears to be qualified for the work. However, the review team would have appreciated a bit more information regarding the specific qualifications of the proposed individual. The response provided also indicated that there are regular meetings with school leadership to further plan for and develop the program. The team also appreciated that everything is located within the school building to allow for seamless transitions. Safe transportation is noted as being provided for all students during the school year and summer. Plans for communication include distribution of monthly newsletters, presentations, etc., which appeared to be adequate to reach the intended stakeholder groups.

The proposal noted an ongoing approach to program evaluation where the bidder would collect various data at different times of year (YPQA, surveys, academic data, etc.). The bidder's data collection appeared to include a good mix of quantitative and qualitative data. The response provided indicated that a formal report to the program's advisory board on evaluation data would occur once per year.

Section III. Budget Proposal	Points Possible: 38	Score: <u>30</u>
-------------------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------------

Evaluation Team Comments:

The narrative provided for the budget had a logical connection to the program goals presented in Appendix D. The budget narrative indicated that the program would serve 78 RLP students at a cost of \$1,918.03 per RLP student. The narrative response indicated that no fees would be charged to students or families to participate in the program. However, the narrative also indicated that it is possible that fees may become necessary in the future. The review team found this questionable and wondered what the bidder's actual plans

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION & NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: LearningWorks (RSU 57)
DATE: 05/09/24

were around the potential for charging program fees. If fees are intended to be charged in the future, there was no real information on what the proposed fee structure would look like, making it impossible for the review team to determine whether such fee structure would be appropriate for the grant. It is noted, however, that the bidder indicated that no students or families would be turned away for the inability to pay program fees. The team also noted strong in-kind contributions from the partnering school district. The narrative also mentioned the need for multiple cell phones for program director and site coordinators, despite there being only one individual fulfilling these roles. The review team found this odd.

The partnering school district is meeting the minimum 35% contribution (\$13,462.00) requirement toward the program's annual transportation costs (\$38,462.00). Overall, the budget information provided in the forms appeared reasonable and was well described. On Form 003, the budget notes only hiring 5-6 program staff for the school year and summer educational programs. With the goal of serving 50 students per day earlier in the proposal, the review team questioned whether the proposed staffing model would be sufficient to maintain the desired staff-to-student ratios for the program.

The program advisory board is noted as having 6 members comprised of bidder and partnering school district staff. While the review team liked seeing the school district superintendent, assistant superintendent, and principal on the board, it was noted that representation from parents and community organizations was lacking. Much of the information provided within the sustainability plan section of the proposal had to do with the bidding organization as a whole. The review team would've expected to see more about the sustainability plans for the 21st CCLC program specifically. The roles and commitments of the bidder and lead partner organization were well defined.

Section IV. Priority Points	Points Possible: 7	Score: <u>1</u>
------------------------------------	--------------------	-----------------

Evaluation Team Comments:

The average free and reduced lunch rate of the school(s) included within the proposal totaled 25%.

One or more Tier 1 schools have been included in the proposal.

Overall, the proposal provided a low level of evidence for other need, citing issues of academic hardship and students living in poverty.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION & NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: RSU 17 (Bryant Pond)
DATE: 05/31/24

Instructions: The purpose of this form is to record all evaluation notes and scoring that is obtained through consensus discussions among the full evaluation team for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. The RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator should complete this form and maintain the only copy. This form should reflect the full team's consensus evaluations, and this form is not meant to take the place of individual evaluation notes, which are still required from each member of the evaluation team. A separate form is available for individual evaluation notes. Please submit a copy of this document to the Division of Purchases as part of your contract award selection documents.

DEPARTMENT NAME: Education
NAME OF RFP COORDINATOR: Travis Doughty
NAMES OF EVALUATORS: Jessica Francis, Luba Greene, Rachelle Tome

POINT SUMMARY

Section I. General Information (Pass/Fail)

Required Item	Pass	Fail	Comments
1. Cover Sheet	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	-
2. Debarment Certification Form	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	-
3. Abstract	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	-
4. Program Demographics	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Number of students and low-performing students in grades served are not included
5. Partners	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	-

Section II. Specifications of Work to Be Performed (55 Total Points)

Planning (Maximum 4 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
Description of the planning process used to submit the application	2	1
Planning meetings and collaborative writing sessions, including multiple parties	2	1
Need for Program (Maximum 6 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
Evaluation of community needs and available resources for the community learning center(s)	3	3
Description of how proposed program will address the identified community needs, in particular the needs of (primarily low-performing) students and working families	3	3
Program Design (Maximum 25 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
Range and type of program activities that will be offered and how those activities will improve student academic achievement and overall student success and align with the academic goals in Appendix D	2	2
Number of students and low-performing students that will be served at each site, grade-levels, average daily attendance	3	2
General schedule of operations for each proposed site is provided; the number of program days/hours are included and meet program minimums outlined in Appendix G	3	2
Staffing ratios alignment with the recommended instructor to student ratios outlined in Appendix G	2	2

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION & NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: RSU 17 (Bryant Pond)
DATE: 05/31/24

<p>Elements of high-quality programming:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Linkages to School Day • Strong Instructional Leadership • Safe and Appropriate Environment • Student-Driven Programming • Regular Attendees 	5	5
<p>All six (6) of the program goals for the 21st CCLC program have been addressed within Appendix D and include the necessary strategies, activities, and proposed outcomes in the areas of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Academic Improvement • Health and Wellness • Educational Enrichment • Parent Education and Family Engagement • Sustainability and Collaboration • Professional and Staff Development 	6	4
<p>All proposed outcomes in Appendix D match the required performance measures (percentages, numbers, frequencies, etc. are provided where requested) and appear realistic, given size and scope of the proposal</p>	4	2
<p>Program Management (Maximum 10 Points)</p>	Points Possible	Points Awarded
<p>Elements of program management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program Leadership • School Leadership Support • Staff and Professional Development • Communication/Information Dissemination • Transportation • Volunteers 	10	6
<p>Program Evaluation (Maximum 10 Points)</p>	Points Possible	Points Awarded
<p>Description of how the program(s) will be based on the following “measures of effectiveness”:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. be based upon an assessment of objective data regarding the need for before and after school (or summer recess) programs and activities in the schools and communities; ii. be based upon an established set of performance measures aimed at ensuring the availability of high-quality academic enrichment programs; iii. if appropriate, be based upon evidence-based research that the program or activity will help students meet the challenging State academic standards and any local academic standards; iv. ensure that measures of student success align with the regular academic program of the school and academic needs of participating students and include performance indicators and measures as determined by the state; and v. collect the data necessary for the measures of student success described in subparagraph (iv) above. 	4	3
<p>Periodic evaluation to assess the providers progress toward its goal of providing high-quality opportunities for academic enrichment</p>	3	3
<p>Results of a periodic evaluation of the proposed program will refine, improve, and strengthen the program and its performance measures as well as how and when the results of periodic evaluations will be made available to the public and used to build community support.</p>	3	1
Section II Total (Max. 55 Points)		40

Section III. Budget Proposal (38 Total Points)

<p>Budget Narrative and Budget Forms (Maximum 25 Points)</p>	Points Possible	Points Awarded
<p>Budget Narrative describes how items within the budget will support the achievement of program goals and performance measures outlined in Appendix D</p>	4	4
<p>Budget Narrative aligns with and provides an explanation of content in the budget forms</p>	3	2

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION & NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: RSU 17 (Bryant Pond)
DATE: 05/31/24

Items are addressed within the Budget Narrative: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Estimated cost per regular, low-performing student • Evidence is provided that there is a commitment of adequate resources for all participants • Fee structure is described, if applicable • Federal, State, and local program resources • Purpose of all expenditures has been described • In-kind contributions from partners that demonstrate the capacity to sustain programming 	6	3
Budget Forms – 001, 002, 003, 004, and 005: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are complete and align with the budget narrative • Illustrate that program transportation costs are shared, with the local school district contributing at least 35% of the overall annual transportation cost • Provide evidence that the requested amount is appropriate and reasonable for the size and scope of the project (most funds going towards expenses directly impacting programming for students) • Provide detailed line-item descriptions (e.g., hours worked per week, rate of pay, weeks per year) • Demonstrate a detailed and logical connection to program goals 	12	6
Capacity for Success and Sustainability (Maximum 13 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
Program advisory board member information has been provided and represents a diverse group of stakeholders	4	2
Sustainability plan, which describes how the community learning center(s) included within the proposal will continue to operate without 21 st CCLC program funding after the anticipated award period ends	5	3
Roles and commitment of key partners, including involvement with program design and implementation	4	3
Section III Total (Max. 38 points)		23

Section IV. Priority Points (7 Total Points)

Priority Points (Maximum 7 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
<u>Poverty Level:</u>		
Percentage of school population eligible for free and reduced price lunch	Less than 45%	Between 45% and 59%
	Between 60% and 75%	Greater than 75%
Point Scale	0 Points	1 Point
	2 Points	3 Points
<u>ESEA Accountability Status:</u>		
ESEA accountability status of the school(s) included within the application	No school(s) eligible for “Tier 1”, “Tier 2”, or “Tier 3” support	One or more schools eligible for “Tier 1” or “Tier 2” support
	One or more schools eligible for “Tier 3” support	
Priority points	0 Points	1 Point
	2 Points	
<u>Other Need:</u>		
Level of evidence within the application	No Evidence	Moderate Evidence
	High Evidence	
Priority points	0 Points	1 Point
	2 Points	
Section V Total (Max. 7 points)		2
OFFICIAL SCORE (Max. 100 points)		65

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION & NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: RSU 17 (Bryant Pond)
DATE: 05/31/24

EVALUATION TEAM NOTES

Section II. Specifications of Work to be Performed	Points Possible: 55	Score: <u>40</u>
<p>Evaluation Team Comments:</p> <p>The overall timeline for proposal development spanned from August to February, with a total of 3 planning meetings and 5.5 hours of planning time. The review team had difficulty in discerning which stakeholder groups were represented in planning meetings, as only names and no affiliations were provided. It is also noted that the bidder described additional planning meetings with parents and other partners that were not listed in the data table. It was unclear why there was a disconnect between the data provided in these two areas of the proposal.</p> <p>The needs assessment aspect of the proposal was strong, including multiple different data points around poverty levels, rate of homelessness among students, and issues with students being chronically absent from school. There was also mention of students performing below grade level expectations in reading and mathematics and the need for additional academic support and interventions. Additionally, concerns were raised about student safety, particularly during times when school is not in session. The plans outlined to address the identified needs appeared to be reasonable and logical in scope. The review team appreciated the inclusion of academic mentoring programming with older students.</p> <p>The proposal includes a diverse range of programming (STEM, sports, the arts, etc.) as well as targeted interventions designed to help students improve academically. It is also noted that there's a connection with the BARR program for supporting the non-academic needs of students. The review team questioned the reality of having 175 students reach RLP status during the year. This was a very large number of students reaching RLP status when compared to the total amount of funding requested. The proposed schedule for school year program is meeting and exceeding the minimum requirements of the RFP. However, the proposed summer program does not meet the minimum requirements set forth in the RFP. The staff-to-student ratios adhere to the requirements in Appendix G of the RFP document but are noted as being on the higher end of the allowable range.</p> <p>In terms of connection to the school day, the program director will attend BARR meetings and connect with content specialists during the school day to help track student progress and determined student needs during afterschool time. The bidder's plan is to hire certified teachers to staff the afterschool program. Proposed training for staff (both volunteers and employees) looked to be appropriate to ensure the health and safety of students attending the program. The review team appreciated the idea of offering students flexible schedules during afterschool time, but questioned whether this design would have some activities reach capacity before all interested students had an opportunity to participate. There was also mention of leveraging student incentives to encourage regular attendance among the students who would benefit most from the program. The review team also liked the approach to marketing the "Viking Adventure" club as a way to pique student interest.</p> <p>In Appendix D of the proposal, the bidder included measurable outcome data for each of the various goal areas. However, the review team noted that the academic improvement targets seemed a bit high when compared to the current academic achievement levels of students. When it came to the strategies and activities portion of this section of the proposal, the review team questioned why many areas included additional outcome data. Many of the strategies and activities responses provided by the bidder were minimal or did not provide the information that had been requested within the RFP. The review team also felt the sustainability goals in Appendix D were low, with minimal partnerships and fundraising over the first couple years of the grant.</p> <p>The bidder provided a clear vision for the program director role and had clear expectations for the position. It is noted that district staff (district, school leaders, and teachers) have been tasked with a variety of responsibilities and the review team questioned whether these staff have been made aware of what would be required of them. The plan is to have shared professional development between the school day and afterschool program staff, focusing on academics, SEL, and other youth development topics. The bidder indicates that it will leverage the school district's existing process for recruiting volunteers. Transportation from the program appeared to only be available 3 days per week, despite the program being open for 5 days per week during the school year and 4 days per week during the summer. The team questioned this, as it could create a barrier to participation for students and families who do not have reliable transportation for the other days of the week. Communication will be disseminated through a variety of mediums to ensure that all stakeholders are reached.</p> <p>The bidder indicated it would review STAR Math and Reading scores, attendance, and survey data as part of its evaluation process. It is also noted that evaluation work will be conducted on a quarterly basis and consist of work between the program director and building principal. The plans for communicating the results of evaluation work appeared to be a bit lacking, relying heavily upon the release of a program newsletter to communicate information. The review team wondered why this information would not be shared with the school or advisory board through a meeting or presentation to update stakeholders on program needs, progress, and development work. The review team felt this was a missed opportunity to coordinate with additional stakeholders and help build buy-in for the program.</p>		

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION & NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: RSU 17 (Bryant Pond)
DATE: 05/31/24

Section III. Budget Proposal	Points Possible: 38	Score: <u>23</u>
<p>Evaluation Team Comments:</p> <p>The budget narrative indicates that 176 RLP students would be served annually, at a cost of \$852.27 per RLP student. The review team questioned the RLP count presented here as it conflicts with earlier figures provided in the RFP (175). The review team also had concerns around the very low cost per RLP student. Given that the RFP would've allowed for up to \$3,000 per RLP student and a total award of \$175,000, the team was confused by the bidder's decisions around request amount and RLP student counts. The team wondered whether the amount per student would be sufficient to deliver a quality program. The narrative indicated that no fees would be charged for program enrollment or participation in order to ensure that all students are able to attend regardless of financial background. The budget narrative did not speak to any transportation services beyond what appeared to be program field trips. The review team questioned how students would get to and from the program during the school year and summer with no additional funding for transportation. The review team also questioned why there was no sort of in-kind or additional funding from either the school district or the Bryant Pond 4-H Camp mentioned in the proposal.</p> <p>The budget forms did not show any additional funding (beyond the 21st CCLC grant award) supporting transportation costs for the program. This does not meet the RFP requirement that the school district cover at least 35% of the annual cost of transporting students to and from the program. On Form 003, positions are set up via hourly wages while the budget narrative notes positions would be set up as stipend positions. Many of the staff positions on Form 003 also span only 40 weeks in length, which would not be sufficient to cover the 44 weeks of programming across the school year and summer programs noted earlier in the proposal. While the overall funding amounts are the same, the review team wondered why this conflicting information was included in the proposal. On Form 005, the review team would've liked clearer descriptions of the funding earmarked for administrative supplies and food. It was unclear why the school district would not try tapping into the USDA snack program to cover costs associated with providing snacks for students.</p> <p>The program advisory board consisted of three members (2 school district representatives and 1 community partner representative). It is noted that no parents or teachers were included on the advisory board. The sustainability plan makes reference to partnerships that don't appear to currently be in place. The review team wondered why there weren't more clear details and actions steps included in the plan to further develop these partnerships. The preliminary plans also include language around applying for supplemental grants and securing additional in-kind contributions from partners. While the bidder and lead partner organizations mention a history of strong partnership, the information provided around the roles and commitments were a bit vague and seemed more general statements of commitment without specific actions steps or details regarding their partnership for this program.</p>		
Section IV. Priority Points	Points Possible: 7	Score: <u>2</u>
<p>Evaluation Team Comments:</p> <p>The average free and reduced lunch rate of the school(s) included within the proposal totaled 44%.</p> <p>One or more Tier 2 schools have been included in the proposal.</p> <p>Overall, the proposal provided a moderate level of evidence for other need, citing high rates of students being chronically absent from school, as well as those experiencing homelessness. The proposal also made note of students being alone after school and getting in trouble with law enforcement within the community.</p>		

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION & NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: RSU 17 (West Paris Explorers)
DATE: 05/31/24

Instructions: The purpose of this form is to record all evaluation notes and scoring that is obtained through consensus discussions among the full evaluation team for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. The RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator should complete this form and maintain the only copy. This form should reflect the full team's consensus evaluations, and this form is not meant to take the place of individual evaluation notes, which are still required from each member of the evaluation team. A separate form is available for individual evaluation notes. Please submit a copy of this document to the Division of Purchases as part of your contract award selection documents.

DEPARTMENT NAME: Education
NAME OF RFP COORDINATOR: Travis Doughty
NAMES OF EVALUATORS: Jessica Francis, Luba Greene, Rachelle Tome

POINT SUMMARY

Section I. General Information (Pass/Fail)

Required Item	Pass	Fail	Comments
1. Cover Sheet	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	-
2. Debarment Certification Form	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	-
3. Abstract	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	-
4. Program Demographics	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	-
5. Partners	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	-

Section II. Specifications of Work to Be Performed (55 Total Points)

Planning (Maximum 4 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
Description of the planning process used to submit the application	2	2
Planning meetings and collaborative writing sessions, including multiple parties	2	1
Need for Program (Maximum 6 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
Evaluation of community needs and available resources for the community learning center(s)	3	2
Description of how proposed program will address the identified community needs, in particular the needs of (primarily low-performing) students and working families	3	1
Program Design (Maximum 25 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
Range and type of program activities that will be offered and how those activities will improve student academic achievement and overall student success and align with the academic goals in Appendix D	2	2
Number of students and low-performing students that will be served at each site, grade-levels, average daily attendance	3	2
General schedule of operations for each proposed site is provided; the number of program days/hours are included and meet program minimums outlined in Appendix G	3	3
Staffing ratios alignment with the recommended instructor to student ratios outlined in Appendix G	2	2

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION & NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: RSU 17 (West Paris Explorers)
DATE: 05/31/24

Elements of high-quality programming: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Linkages to School Day • Strong Instructional Leadership • Safe and Appropriate Environment • Student-Driven Programming • Regular Attendees 	5	5
All six (6) of the program goals for the 21 st CCLC program have been addressed within Appendix D and include the necessary strategies, activities, and proposed outcomes in the areas of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Academic Improvement • Health and Wellness • Educational Enrichment • Parent Education and Family Engagement • Sustainability and Collaboration • Professional and Staff Development 	6	4
All proposed outcomes in Appendix D match the required performance measures (percentages, numbers, frequencies, etc. are provided where requested) and appear realistic, given size and scope of the proposal	4	4
Program Management (Maximum 10 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
Elements of program management: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program Leadership • School Leadership Support • Staff and Professional Development • Communication/Information Dissemination • Transportation • Volunteers 	10	8
Program Evaluation (Maximum 10 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
Description of how the program(s) will be based on the following “measures of effectiveness”: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. be based upon an assessment of objective data regarding the need for before and after school (or summer recess) programs and activities in the schools and communities; ii. be based upon an established set of performance measures aimed at ensuring the availability of high-quality academic enrichment programs; iii. if appropriate, be based upon evidence-based research that the program or activity will help students meet the challenging State academic standards and any local academic standards; iv. ensure that measures of student success align with the regular academic program of the school and academic needs of participating students and include performance indicators and measures as determined by the state; and v. collect the data necessary for the measures of student success described in subparagraph (iv) above. 	4	4
Periodic evaluation to assess the providers progress toward its goal of providing high-quality opportunities for academic enrichment	3	3
Results of a periodic evaluation of the proposed program will refine, improve, and strengthen the program and its performance measures as well as how and when the results of periodic evaluations will be made available to the public and used to build community support.	3	3
Section II Total (Max. 55 Points)		46

Section III. Budget Proposal (38 Total Points)

Budget Narrative and Budget Forms (Maximum 25 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
Budget Narrative describes how items within the budget will support the achievement of program goals and performance measures outlined in Appendix D	4	4
Budget Narrative aligns with and provides an explanation of content in the budget forms	3	2

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION & NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: RSU 17 (West Paris Explorers)
DATE: 05/31/24

Items are addressed within the Budget Narrative: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Estimated cost per regular, low-performing student • Evidence is provided that there is a commitment of adequate resources for all participants • Fee structure is described, if applicable • Federal, State, and local program resources • Purpose of all expenditures has been described • In-kind contributions from partners that demonstrate the capacity to sustain programming 	6	5
Budget Forms – 001, 002, 003, 004, and 005: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are complete and align with the budget narrative • Illustrate that program transportation costs are shared, with the local school district contributing at least 35% of the overall annual transportation cost • Provide evidence that the requested amount is appropriate and reasonable for the size and scope of the project (most funds going towards expenses directly impacting programming for students) • Provide detailed line-item descriptions (e.g., hours worked per week, rate of pay, weeks per year) • Demonstrate a detailed and logical connection to program goals 	12	9
Capacity for Success and Sustainability (Maximum 13 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
Program advisory board member information has been provided and represents a diverse group of stakeholders	4	3
Sustainability plan, which describes how the community learning center(s) included within the proposal will continue to operate without 21 st CCLC program funding after the anticipated award period ends	5	4
Roles and commitment of key partners, including involvement with program design and implementation	4	4
Section III Total (Max. 38 points)		31

Section IV. Priority Points (7 Total Points)

Priority Points (Maximum 7 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
<u>Poverty Level:</u>		
Percentage of school population eligible for free and reduced-price lunch	Less than 45% Between 45% and 59% Between 60% and 75% Greater than 75%	3
Point Scale	0 Points 1 Point 2 Points 3 Points	1
<u>ESEA Accountability Status:</u>		
ESEA accountability status of the school(s) included within the application	No school(s) eligible for “Tier 1”, “Tier 2”, or “Tier 3” support One or more schools eligible for “Tier 1” or “Tier 2” support One or more schools eligible for “Tier 3” support	2
Priority points	0 Points 1 Point 2 Points	1
<u>Other Need:</u>		
Level of evidence within the application	No Evidence Moderate Evidence High Evidence	2
Priority points	0 Points 1 Point 2 Points	1
Section V Total (Max. 7 points)		3
OFFICIAL SCORE (Max. 100 points)		80

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION & NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: RSU 17 (West Paris Explorers)
DATE: 05/31/24

EVALUATION TEAM NOTES

Section II. Specifications of Work to be Performed	Points Possible: 55	Score: 46
<p>Evaluation Team Comments:</p> <p>The overall planning process consisted of 12 meetings over the course of 4 months, totaling 9.5 hours of planning time. While the planning process included a variety of stakeholders, greater participation from community members would have enhanced the planning process. The review team also noted that the information provided around planning often included individual names but not what stakeholder group or organization the participants represented. This made it difficult to determine which stakeholder groups were represented at various planning meetings.</p> <p>The needs assessment cited a Maine Kids Count report for Oxford County on data related to poverty. The review team questioned this as the data was for the entire county as opposed to the individual school population to be served. School attendance data, however, did also show that 34% of students were chronically absent from school. There was also mention of the need to support working families, with limited alternative care options for students. The narrative provided seemed to be missing data on academic performance for the students targeted in the proposal. Overall, the needs assessment was based more on community data and factors impacting students and families. While this data is relevant to demonstrate the need for such a program, the review team would've liked a bit more focus on the academic needs of students. The response provided was also a bit weak in terms of how the bidder would address the needs identified through the proposed program.</p> <p>The program design is focused on academic achievement and social-emotional learning, incorporating things like youth choice into programming. The review team questioned the approach to rotating students in and out of 6-week programming blocks, as it might make it difficult for students to reach 30 days of attendance. It could also prove challenging to meeting the needs of working families if students can only attend the program sporadically throughout the year. The proposed instructional hours for both the school year and summer programs meet and far exceed the requirements established in the RFP. The staff to student ratios for different activity types seem to align with requirements of Appendix G. The review team questioned what was being done by the bidder to address staffing issues that have led to challenges with student enrollment.</p> <p>Programming is linked to STAR data with standards being selected monthly in meetings between school district and community organization staff. The school district's RTI system is used to determine the focus of instruction during the afterschool program, further supporting the strong connection with school-day learning program. The response provided noted many industry-standard safety protocols in place as well as others that were nice to see. Students are divided into grade-level "pods" to participate in age-appropriate activities with their peers. These same student "pods" can voice the types of activities that they would like to participate in. The program offers a flexible schedule where students and families can sign up to attend the program on certain days of the week, with enrollment paperwork requiring a 30-day minimum attendance requirement. The program's work with parents, particularly during the enrollment process, was quite innovative and a real strength of the program.</p> <p>The overall goals noted in Appendix D of the proposal were well-developed. However, the review team notes that many of the goal areas did not include very descriptive information on the strategies and activities that would be carried out. Academic improvement strategies and activities are noted as not including any research- or evidence-based practices to help address student growth or proficiency. However, the family engagement section of Appendix D is noted as being quite strong. The responses provided around sustainability and collaboration goals were also well articulated. The review team also liked that the bidder was leveraging early release days from the school district to provide additional programming for students and families. It was also noted that the fundraising goals may have been a bit high for a community with limited businesses and organizations to provide additional funding.</p> <p>The proposal included a strong response around program leadership and there was evidence of a fruitful partnership with school leadership. Communication plans were also strong. The overall plans for professional development seemed a bit light and the review team would've liked a bit more detail around the frequency and content of professional development to be provided to staff. The proposal included a thorough description of the policy used for recruiting and working with volunteers. The overall plans for transportation were a bit vague and the review team would've liked more information on how students will make it home after the program ends. It was unclear what transportation services would look like during the summer program.</p> <p>The program's evaluation plan uses a combination of data sources (STAR, Freckle, Second Step, etc.) and a cycle of continuous improvement. The program's administrative team conducts an evaluation at the conclusion of each 6-week program period to determine needed improvement work. Coordination with the school district around the review of data will occur on a monthly basis. The program also has plans to report out annually to both the school board and the Town of West Paris Budget Committee to help further build buy-in and support for the program. The bidder also indicated that completed evaluation reports would be shared at annual Title I parent meetings.</p>		

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION & NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: RSU 17 (West Paris Explorers)
DATE: 05/31/24

Section III. Budget Proposal	Points Possible: 38	Score: <u>31</u>
<p>Evaluation Team Comments:</p> <p>The budget narrative provided seemed to align with both the goals in Appendix D. There was a disparity in the amount of transportation funding being contributed by RSU 17 between the budget narrative (29%) and budget forms (33%). The program has proposed to serve 40 RLP students, which amounts to a cost per RLP student of \$2,500. The narrative indicates the program has been in operation for many years (both with and without 21st CCLC funding). Targeted low-performing students are able to enroll in the program at no cost, with other students being able to register on a sliding fee scale. The review team wondered what the cost for participating in the program was for non-targeted students. It would have been nice to have a better sense of the fees that would be charged to some students and families. Earlier in the proposal, the bidder noted that students could earn free sessions for consistent attendance. However, there was no mention of this within the program’s fee structure narrative.</p> <p>The review team noted that the budget forms indicate that school district would contribute 33% of the cost of bus transportation for students. This does not meet the minimum requirement of 35% of the annual transportation costs established in the RFP. There is a clear disconnect between what the school district is planning to contribute versus what the minimum requirement would be. The review team questioned the disparity between hourly rates for different types of positions within the budget. For example, tutors appeared to be making nearly three times the hourly wage as regular program staff. Understanding that there are often nuances to working with teacher contracts, the review team worried that the significantly lower wages for program staff could result in having difficulty finding qualified candidates. It is also noted that Budget Form 005 could have included greater line-item descriptions for things like supplies and staff travel to give the team a better sense of what funds were being used for.</p> <p>The overall response around program advisory board seemed to be fairly minimal, with only 7 board members—4 of whom are either school district or program staff. The review team recommended that additional partner organization representatives be tapped to help support the ongoing work of the board and the program’s goals around sustainability. However, it was nice to see multiple parents serving on the program’s advisory board. The review team particularly liked the idea of “growing ownership” of the program over time. The program has a 20-year history of success with buy-in and support from a variety of stakeholders. Partnerships and program fees were noted as avenues to help sustain the program following the end of the 21st CCLC grant award. However, there does not seem to be a fully developed plan for sustainability at this point. The roles and commitments of both organizations were well-defined.</p>		
Section IV. Priority Points	Points Possible: 7	Score: <u>3</u>
<p>Evaluation Team Comments:</p> <p>The average free and reduced lunch rate of the school(s) included within the proposal totaled 50%.</p> <p>One or more Tier 2 schools have been included in the proposal.</p> <p>Overall, the proposal provided a moderate level of evidence for other need, citing local poverty data and high rates of chronically absent students along with limited opportunities for students in the SAU to participate in other afterschool programs.</p>		

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION & NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: RSU 24 (Maine Seacoast Mission)
DATE: 05/31/24

Instructions: The purpose of this form is to record all evaluation notes and scoring that is obtained through consensus discussions among the full evaluation team for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. The RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator should complete this form and maintain the only copy. This form should reflect the full team's consensus evaluations, and this form is not meant to take the place of individual evaluation notes, which are still required from each member of the evaluation team. A separate form is available for individual evaluation notes. Please submit a copy of this document to the Division of Purchases as part of your contract award selection documents.

DEPARTMENT NAME: Education
NAME OF RFP COORDINATOR: Travis Doughty
NAMES OF EVALUATORS: Jessica Francis, Luba Greene, Rachelle Tome

POINT SUMMARY

Section I. General Information (Pass/Fail)

Required Item	Pass	Fail	Comments
1. Cover Sheet	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	-
2. Debarment Certification Form	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	-
3. Abstract	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	-
4. Program Demographics	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	-
5. Partners	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	-

Section II. Specifications of Work to Be Performed (55 Total Points)

Planning (Maximum 4 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
Description of the planning process used to submit the application	2	2
Planning meetings and collaborative writing sessions, including multiple parties	2	2
Need for Program (Maximum 6 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
Evaluation of community needs and available resources for the community learning center(s)	3	3
Description of how proposed program will address the identified community needs, in particular the needs of (primarily low-performing) students and working families	3	3
Program Design (Maximum 25 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
Range and type of program activities that will be offered and how those activities will improve student academic achievement and overall student success and align with the academic goals in Appendix D	2	2
Number of students and low-performing students that will be served at each site, grade-levels, average daily attendance	3	3
General schedule of operations for each proposed site is provided; the number of program days/hours are included and meet program minimums outlined in Appendix G	3	3
Staffing ratios alignment with the recommended instructor to student ratios outlined in Appendix G	2	2

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION & NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: RSU 24 (Maine Seacoast Mission)
DATE: 05/31/24

<p>Elements of high-quality programming:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Linkages to School Day • Strong Instructional Leadership • Safe and Appropriate Environment • Student-Driven Programming • Regular Attendees 	5	5
<p>All six (6) of the program goals for the 21st CCLC program have been addressed within Appendix D and include the necessary strategies, activities, and proposed outcomes in the areas of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Academic Improvement • Health and Wellness • Educational Enrichment • Parent Education and Family Engagement • Sustainability and Collaboration • Professional and Staff Development 	6	6
<p>All proposed outcomes in Appendix D match the required performance measures (percentages, numbers, frequencies, etc. are provided where requested) and appear realistic, given size and scope of the proposal</p>	4	4
<p>Program Management (Maximum 10 Points)</p>	Points Possible	Points Awarded
<p>Elements of program management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program Leadership • School Leadership Support • Staff and Professional Development • Communication/Information Dissemination • Transportation • Volunteers 	10	10
<p>Program Evaluation (Maximum 10 Points)</p>	Points Possible	Points Awarded
<p>Description of how the program(s) will be based on the following “measures of effectiveness”:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. be based upon an assessment of objective data regarding the need for before and after school (or summer recess) programs and activities in the schools and communities; ii. be based upon an established set of performance measures aimed at ensuring the availability of high-quality academic enrichment programs; iii. if appropriate, be based upon evidence-based research that the program or activity will help students meet the challenging State academic standards and any local academic standards; iv. ensure that measures of student success align with the regular academic program of the school and academic needs of participating students and include performance indicators and measures as determined by the state; and v. collect the data necessary for the measures of student success described in subparagraph (iv) above. 	4	4
<p>Periodic evaluation to assess the providers progress toward its goal of providing high-quality opportunities for academic enrichment</p>	3	3
<p>Results of a periodic evaluation of the proposed program will refine, improve, and strengthen the program and its performance measures as well as how and when the results of periodic evaluations will be made available to the public and used to build community support.</p>	3	3
Section II Total (Max. 55 Points)		55

Section III. Budget Proposal (38 Total Points)

<p>Budget Narrative and Budget Forms (Maximum 25 Points)</p>	Points Possible	Points Awarded
<p>Budget Narrative describes how items within the budget will support the achievement of program goals and performance measures outlined in Appendix D</p>	4	4
<p>Budget Narrative aligns with and provides an explanation of content in the budget forms</p>	3	2

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION & NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: RSU 24 (Maine Seacoast Mission)
DATE: 05/31/24

Items are addressed within the Budget Narrative: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Estimated cost per regular, low-performing student • Evidence is provided that there is a commitment of adequate resources for all participants • Fee structure is described, if applicable • Federal, State, and local program resources • Purpose of all expenditures has been described • In-kind contributions from partners that demonstrate the capacity to sustain programming 	6	6
Budget Forms – 001, 002, 003, 004, and 005: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are complete and align with the budget narrative • Illustrate that program transportation costs are shared, with the local school district contributing at least 35% of the overall annual transportation cost • Provide evidence that the requested amount is appropriate and reasonable for the size and scope of the project (most funds going towards expenses directly impacting programming for students) • Provide detailed line-item descriptions (e.g., hours worked per week, rate of pay, weeks per year) • Demonstrate a detailed and logical connection to program goals 	12	11
Capacity for Success and Sustainability (Maximum 13 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
Program advisory board member information has been provided and represents a diverse group of stakeholders	4	4
Sustainability plan, which describes how the community learning center(s) included within the proposal will continue to operate without 21 st CCLC program funding after the anticipated award period ends	5	4
Roles and commitment of key partners, including involvement with program design and implementation	4	4
Section III Total (Max. 38 points)		35

Section IV. Priority Points (7 Total Points)

Priority Points (Maximum 7 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
<u>Poverty Level:</u>		
Percentage of school population eligible for free and reduced-price lunch	Less than 45%	Between 45% and 59%
	Between 60% and 75%	Greater than 75%
Point Scale	0 Points	1 Point
	2 Points	3 Points
<u>ESEA Accountability Status:</u>		
ESEA accountability status of the school(s) included within the application	No school(s) eligible for “Tier 1”, “Tier 2”, or “Tier 3” support	One or more schools eligible for “Tier 1” or “Tier 2” support
	One or more schools eligible for “Tier 3” support	
Priority points	0 Points	1 Point
	2 Points	
<u>Other Need:</u>		
Level of evidence within the application	No Evidence	Moderate Evidence
	High Evidence	
Priority points	0 Points	1 Point
	2 Points	
Section V Total (Max. 7 points)		1
OFFICIAL SCORE (Max. 100 points)		91

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION & NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: RSU 24 (Maine Seacoast Mission)
DATE: 05/31/24

EVALUATION TEAM NOTES

Section II. Specifications of Work to be Performed	Points Possible: 55	Score: <u>55</u>
<p>Evaluation Team Comments:</p> <p>The planning process began in November and concluded in March, totaling roughly 20 hours. The program director is noted as being very involved in the planning process and there were several meetings with various community partners. It is also noted that survey tools were used to gather input from various stakeholder groups (i.e. students, parents, and community members).</p> <p>A strong case is presented for the need for the program. There is a high need among families and limited community resources to support those needs. The school district has high levels of students who are underperforming in mathematics and literacy as well as students living in poverty. Food insecurity was noted as a real challenge for families. The review team also appreciated the partnership with adult education specifically for programming to support parent education and workforce development skills. The bidder also provided a sound plan of how it would address the identified needs through the delivery of a 21st CCLC program.</p> <p>The program's design is rooted in sound youth develop principals and includes intentional partnership with the district's Title I program and community partners. A total of 72 RLP students would be served across the two program sites, with plans to encourage regular attendance among students (incentives, communication with parents, etc.). The instructional hours for both the school year and summer both meet and far exceed the minimum requirements set forth in the RFP. The staff-to-student ratios are within the ranges required in the RFP and are also noted as being on the lower end of the spectrum.</p> <p>The school day program and 21st CCLC program share staff, so there is a strong connection between both programs in terms of planning, professional development, etc. The program also had a strong process in place for requirements of staff who work in the afterschool program (i.e. qualifications). The response provided around student safety was sound and included topics such as PBIS, 40 developmental assets, responsive classroom, and plans to further support academic and behavioral interventions both during and after the regular school day. The review team made note of the strong partnership with the school district's Title I program to meet the academic needs of students. Parent involvement and attendance in the overall design of the program was strong, with innovative approaches to supporting engagement.</p> <p>The goals presented in Appendix D appear to be both realistic and achievable, with strategies and activities being varied and often including community partnerships. Examples of this included partnering with the Hancock County Police Department for implementation of the DARE program and the University of Maine for parenting classes and other informational events. The review team appreciated the use of individualized learning plans to help students and the program reach their goals. The review team was also impressed with the level of family engagement work to be carried out through the program—options are varied, and a notable number of parents are expected to participate in and support program activities. Overall, the review team felt this portion of the proposal was very cohesive with the earlier sections of the proposal, particularly around program design.</p> <p>The staffing structure includes a successful program director who is already in place. The shared staffing structure between the school day and after school program helps build a natural connection between the two. The program receives regular support from school and district leaders, as they oversee the program director and are involved in the staff hiring process. Professional and staff development plans were robust and included a wide breadth and depth of youth development topics. The program has a strong pool of volunteers that are supporting the program, which lends itself to the overall goal of sustainability for the program. Communication plans seemed robust with information being shared with families, school personnel, and community members through a variety of mediums.</p> <p>The program has a strong evaluation plan that leverages several different formative and summative assessments, as well as other data, to gauge the success of the program and determine areas of needed improvement. The program indicates the use of a continuous improvement process, where data is reviewed on a regular (monthly) basis and actions related to findings of data reviews taking place on a regular basis. More formalized presentations to partners and stakeholders regarding program data occur less frequently (3-4 times per year).</p>		
Section III. Budget Proposal	Points Possible: 38	Score: <u>35</u>
<p>Evaluation Team Comments:</p> <p>The review team felt the budget was well organized, with a clear connection to the goals in Appendix D and figures in the budget forms. The bidder has proposed to serve 76 RLP students at a cost of \$2,395 per RLP student. The narrative does indicate that the program will include one-time sliding scale registration fees with scholarships for any students and families who are unable to afford the fees. While program fees are usually discouraged, the structure of the fees outlined in the proposal seem reasonable and strike a good</p>		

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION & NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: RSU 24 (Maine Seacoast Mission)
DATE: 05/31/24

balance between supporting program sustainability without creating too much of a barrier to participation for low-income students and families. The program is noted as having contributions of \$14,400 in funding through the school district's Title I program. However, the \$40,645.80 in funding from a separate 21st CCLC grant award is not mentioned in the budget narrative.

Overall, the budget forms included the information requested and represented a relatively sound budget for the program. The overall transportation cost for the program were \$23,112.05, with the school district providing \$12,374.55 (55%) in local funds for transportation. The amount of in-kind contributions from various partners on Form 001 was impressive. On Form 002, the team noted there was only \$3,000 in program income from fees listed and no additional fundraising dollars noted despite the budget narrative indicating \$8,000 worth of income across both program fees and fundraisers. On Form 005, line 3, the review team had questions about the camp scholarships, as this was the first time these opportunities were noted in the proposal. Additionally, Form 005, line 13, the review team questioned why there was funding allocated to bus driver sign-on bonuses over the summer. This seemed like an expense that would be more appropriately paid for through local funds as opposed to federal funding and the review team questioned whether it would be allowable under this grant program.

The proposed program has a demonstrated history of success and collaborative approach to planning and facilitating the 21st CCLC program. The program's advisory board has 19 members and includes both parents and student representatives. The preliminary sustainability plan for the program includes enhancing existing partnerships and further exploring the collection of program fees. The plan did not appear to be fully developed but looked to be a good starting point to continue to build from. The roles and commitments of the two partnering organizations are clearly outlined.

Section IV. Priority Points	Points Possible: 7	Score: <u>1</u>
------------------------------------	--------------------	-----------------

Evaluation Team Comments:

The average free and reduced lunch rate of the school(s) included within the proposal totaled 45%.

No Tier 1, 2, or 3 schools have been included in the proposal.

Overall, the proposal provided a low level of evidence for other need, citing limited opportunities for families within the community. The options that are available are expensive. The communities served by the program have high rates of poverty and food insecurity.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION & NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: RSU 54 MSAD 54 (Kennebec Valley Community Action Program)
DATE: 05/09/24

Instructions: The purpose of this form is to record all evaluation notes and scoring that is obtained through consensus discussions among the full evaluation team for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. The RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator should complete this form and maintain the only copy. This form should reflect the full team's consensus evaluations, and this form is not meant to take the place of individual evaluation notes, which are still required from each member of the evaluation team. A separate form is available for individual evaluation notes. Please submit a copy of this document to the Division of Purchases as part of your contract award selection documents.

DEPARTMENT NAME: Education
NAME OF RFP COORDINATOR: Travis Doughty
NAMES OF EVALUATORS: Jessica Francis, Luba Greene, Rachelle Tome

POINT SUMMARY

Section I. General Information (Pass/Fail)

Required Item	Pass	Fail	Comments
1. Cover Sheet	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	-
2. Debarment Certification Form	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	-
3. Abstract	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	-
4. Program Demographics	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	-
5. Partners	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	-

Section II. Specifications of Work to Be Performed (55 Total Points)

Planning (Maximum 4 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
Description of the planning process used to submit the application	2	2
Planning meetings and collaborative writing sessions, including multiple parties	2	1
Need for Program (Maximum 6 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
Evaluation of community needs and available resources for the community learning center(s)	3	3
Description of how proposed program will address the identified community needs, in particular the needs of (primarily low-performing) students and working families	3	3
Program Design (Maximum 25 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
Range and type of program activities that will be offered and how those activities will improve student academic achievement and overall student success and align with the academic goals in Appendix D	2	2
Number of students and low-performing students that will be served at each site, grade-levels, average daily attendance	3	3
General schedule of operations for each proposed site is provided; the number of program days/hours are included and meet program minimums outlined in Appendix G	3	3
Staffing ratios alignment with the recommended instructor to student ratios outlined in Appendix G	2	2

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION & NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: RSU 54 MSAD 54 (Kennebec Valley Community Action Program)
DATE: 05/09/24

<p>Elements of high-quality programming:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Linkages to School Day • Strong Instructional Leadership • Safe and Appropriate Environment • Student-Driven Programming • Regular Attendees 	5	5
<p>All six (6) of the program goals for the 21st CCLC program have been addressed within Appendix D and include the necessary strategies, activities, and proposed outcomes in the areas of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Academic Improvement • Health and Wellness • Educational Enrichment • Parent Education and Family Engagement • Sustainability and Collaboration • Professional and Staff Development 	6	6
<p>All proposed outcomes in Appendix D match the required performance measures (percentages, numbers, frequencies, etc. are provided where requested) and appear realistic, given size and scope of the proposal</p>	4	4
Program Management (Maximum 10 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
<p>Elements of program management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program Leadership • School Leadership Support • Staff and Professional Development • Communication/Information Dissemination • Transportation • Volunteers 	10	10
Program Evaluation (Maximum 10 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
<p>Description of how the program(s) will be based on the following “measures of effectiveness”:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. be based upon an assessment of objective data regarding the need for before and after school (or summer recess) programs and activities in the schools and communities; ii. be based upon an established set of performance measures aimed at ensuring the availability of high-quality academic enrichment programs; iii. if appropriate, be based upon evidence-based research that the program or activity will help students meet the challenging State academic standards and any local academic standards; iv. ensure that measures of student success align with the regular academic program of the school and academic needs of participating students and include performance indicators and measures as determined by the state; and v. collect the data necessary for the measures of student success described in subparagraph (iv) above. 	4	4
<p>Periodic evaluation to assess the providers progress toward its goal of providing high-quality opportunities for academic enrichment</p>	3	2
<p>Results of a periodic evaluation of the proposed program will refine, improve, and strengthen the program and its performance measures as well as how and when the results of periodic evaluations will be made available to the public and used to build community support.</p>	3	3
Section II Total (Max. 55 Points)		53

Section III. Budget Proposal (38 Total Points)

Budget Narrative and Budget Forms (Maximum 25 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
<p>Budget Narrative describes how items within the budget will support the achievement of program goals and performance measures outlined in Appendix D</p>	4	4
<p>Budget Narrative aligns with and provides an explanation of content in the budget forms</p>	3	3

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION & NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: RSU 54 MSAD 54 (Kennebec Valley Community Action Program)
DATE: 05/09/24

Items are addressed within the Budget Narrative: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Estimated cost per regular, low-performing student • Evidence is provided that there is a commitment of adequate resources for all participants • Fee structure is described, if applicable • Federal, State, and local program resources • Purpose of all expenditures has been described • In-kind contributions from partners that demonstrate the capacity to sustain programming 	6	6
Budget Forms – 001, 002, 003, 004, and 005: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are complete and align with the budget narrative • Illustrate that program transportation costs are shared, with the local school district contributing at least 35% of the overall annual transportation cost • Provide evidence that the requested amount is appropriate and reasonable for the size and scope of the project (most funds going towards expenses directly impacting programming for students) • Provide detailed line-item descriptions (e.g., hours worked per week, rate of pay, weeks per year) • Demonstrate a detailed and logical connection to program goals 	12	10
Capacity for Success and Sustainability (Maximum 13 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
Program advisory board member information has been provided and represents a diverse group of stakeholders	4	4
Sustainability plan, which describes how the community learning center(s) included within the proposal will continue to operate without 21 st CCLC program funding after the anticipated award period ends	5	5
Roles and commitment of key partners, including involvement with program design and implementation	4	4
Section III Total (Max. 38 points)		36

Section IV. Priority Points (7 Total Points)

Priority Points (Maximum 7 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
<u>Poverty Level:</u>		
Percentage of school population eligible for free and reduced price lunch	Less than 45%	Between 45% and 59%
	Between 60% and 75%	Greater than 75%
Point Scale	0 Points	1 Point
	2 Points	3 Points
	3	2
<u>ESEA Accountability Status:</u>		
ESEA accountability status of the school(s) included within the application	No school(s) eligible for “Tier 1”, “Tier 2”, or “Tier 3” support	One or more schools eligible for “Tier 1” or “Tier 2” support
	One or more schools eligible for “Tier 3” support	
Priority points	0 Points	1 Point
	2 Points	2
<u>Other Need:</u>		
Level of evidence within the application	No Evidence	Moderate Evidence
	High Evidence	
Priority points	0 Points	1 Point
	2 Points	2
Section V Total (Max. 7 points)		6
OFFICIAL SCORE (Max. 100 points)		95

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION & NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: RSU 54 MSAD 54 (Kennebec Valley Community Action Program)
DATE: 05/09/24

EVALUATION TEAM NOTES

Section II. Specifications of Work to be Performed	Points Possible: 55	Score: <u>53</u>
<p>Evaluation Team Comments:</p> <p>The overall planning process for the proposal spanned from June to April, totaling over 100 hours of planning time. There is evidence of many individuals having collaborated in the planning process. However, the review team would have appreciated some additional information regarding either positions or affiliations for these individuals. The review team found themselves questioning who some individuals were or what stakeholder group they represented.</p> <p>The needs assessments for the program included a strong rationale for the program, citing poverty and economic impacts to the local community as well as student academic and health data. The data around need also nicely tied into the proposed plans for how the bidder would address those needs through the delivery of the proposed afterschool program. The review team also appreciated the use of citations for the sources of data presented in this portion of the proposal.</p> <p>The program design included a wide range of topics for students in different age groups covering areas like STEM, literacy, and risk prevention. The review team noted there was heavy use of acronyms in this section of the proposal, which made some information difficult to interpret. The proposed number of students to be served was impressive and seemed to account for a majority of students in the eligible grade levels. The proposed school year and summer instructional hours met the minimum requirements set forth in the RFP. The staff-to-student ratios also fell within the allowable range noted in the RFP, with differentiated ratios for different grade spans. The review team particularly appreciated the smaller staff-to-student ratios for programming at the K-2 level.</p> <p>The bidder's response indicates that multiple strategies will be used for linking and connecting with school day staff and programming. The director and site coordinator are invited to student meetings (i.e. RTI meetings, IEP meetings, parent teacher conferences) as needed. The review team appreciated the presence of high-quality experiential learning with many community partners for students. It is evident that students have autonomy and choice about programming. The review team also appreciated that a student serves on the program's advisory board and that students are regularly surveyed to determine needs and wants for programming. The bidder also noted the use of trauma-informed and social-emotional learning (SEL) principles for both programming and professional development. The review team also appreciated the fact that the school counselor/social worker is serving on the program's advisory board. In terms of ensuring regular attendance, there is also a plan in place to regularly communicate with parents of participating students—particularly when students begin missing program days.</p> <p>In Appendix D of the proposal, the bidder has done a great job of outlining the goals for the program and presenting information for how those goals will be met. Very specific strategies and activities have been provided, which loop in the various partner organizations that had been mentioned earlier in the proposal. The review team appreciated this logical connection and knowing how different partners would "fit" into the larger picture of the program. The review team also appreciated the unique ideas and plans around family engagement, noting specifically things like family guidebooks, book studies, and guest speakers. It was also nice to see programming opportunities planned in connection with other area community organizations (i.e. JMG, KVCAP, etc.).</p> <p>The bidder included a thorough description of the skills, background, and knowledge that would be required of their program director. The organizational hierarchy was also clearly defined in terms of the structure for oversight and decision making. In terms of support from school leadership, there are frequent meetings planned between the program director and school leaders through the year. The team also appreciated the idea of having next school day follow-ups for behavioral incidents that occur during the afterschool program. All program staff are required to fulfill the Maine Roads to Quality youth development credentials. The team appreciated that all staff have some level of shared professional development. The bidder also provided a notable list of volunteers from community organizations and the process for recruitment of volunteers was strong. Communication plans are noted as being robust and being provided through a multitude of mediums to reach target audiences. Plans for transportation were sound and met the minimum requirements set forth in the RFP.</p> <p>The bidder's evaluation plans included a good mix of data elements (surveys, program quality assessments, school day attendance, academic performance, etc.). The bidder also did a nice job of describing how data will be used to inform program improvement efforts. That said, it wasn't always clear when data would be collected or when specific evaluation work would take place. The bidder noted desire to embody a culture of data-driven innovation and continuous improvement. The review team noted that results would be shared through a variety of mediums with different stakeholder groups. However, the proposal was not explicit on how often data would be shared with stakeholders. The review team got the impression that this would be an annual process but would have preferred this to have been specified by the bidder.</p>		

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION & NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: RSU 54 MSAD 54 (Kennebec Valley Community Action Program)
DATE: 05/09/24

Section III. Budget Proposal	Points Possible: 38	Score: <u>36</u>
<p>Evaluation Team Comments:</p> <p>The budget narrative aligned well with the goals presented in Appendix D. The budget narrative also notes 253 RLP students to be served, at a cost per RLP student of \$1,166.00. The review team noted that the cost per RLP student seemed low, but also noted that the proposal included a significant level of outside funding and in-kind resources to offset costs. The bidder indicates that no fees will be charged to students or families to participate in the program. The narrative also included a nice summary of other federal funding sources (i.e. Title I, SPED, CTE) that would be tapped into to support the proposed program.</p> <p>The annual transportation costs for the program totaled \$30,406.98, with the school district providing roughly 31% (\$9,611.00) of the total annual cost for transporting students to and from the program. This seems to conflict with information provided earlier in the proposal, which stated that the partnering school district would provide 35% of the cost of transportation for the year. This amount of transportation funding from the school district falls short of meeting the 35% requirement in the RFP. Aside from this discrepancy, the budget forms have been well developed and included adequate descriptions of proposed expenses. The review team particularly like the significant in-kind contributions from different partner organizations.</p> <p>The program advisory board was robust with 17 members, including student representation and parents. In addition, there was good representation from both the school district and several community partners. There was a comprehensive, 4-year plan for sustainability included in the proposal, with concrete action steps for building relationships and coordination with community partners. In year 2 of the grant, the program plans to become a licensed child-care program. The school district is also regularly increasing funding to further support the 21st CCLC program. It was noted that program partners are always invited to attend family engagement events, further supporting the strong process of partnership with outside organizations. The role and commitments of both the school district and community partner organization appear to be well-defined.</p>		
Section IV. Priority Points	Points Possible: 7	Score: <u>6</u>
<p>Evaluation Team Comments:</p> <p>The average free and reduced lunch rate of the school(s) included within the proposal totaled 66%.</p> <p>One or more Tier 3 schools have been included in the proposal.</p> <p>Overall, the proposal provided a high level of evidence for other need, citing a mix academic-, health-, and economic-related data. The proposal included information on poverty levels and loss of jobs in the area to be served as well as increased rates of child abuse and neglect. Data from the Maine Integrated Youth Health Survey (MIYHS) indicated that other issues within the community related to ACES, bullying, thoughts of suicide, and substance abuse.</p>		

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION & NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: RSU 67 (Lincoln Recreation Department)
DATE: 05/31/24

Instructions: The purpose of this form is to record all evaluation notes and scoring that is obtained through consensus discussions among the full evaluation team for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. The RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator should complete this form and maintain the only copy. This form should reflect the full team's consensus evaluations, and this form is not meant to take the place of individual evaluation notes, which are still required from each member of the evaluation team. A separate form is available for individual evaluation notes. Please submit a copy of this document to the Division of Purchases as part of your contract award selection documents.

DEPARTMENT NAME: Education
NAME OF RFP COORDINATOR: Travis Doughty
NAMES OF EVALUATORS: Jessica Francis, Luba Greene, Rachelle Tome

POINT SUMMARY

Section I. General Information (Pass/Fail)

Required Item	Pass	Fail	Comments
1. Cover Sheet	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	-
2. Debarment Certification Form	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	-
3. Abstract	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	-
4. Program Demographics	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	-
5. Partners	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	-

Section II. Specifications of Work to Be Performed (55 Total Points)

Planning (Maximum 4 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
Description of the planning process used to submit the application	2	1
Planning meetings and collaborative writing sessions, including multiple parties	2	1
Need for Program (Maximum 6 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
Evaluation of community needs and available resources for the community learning center(s)	3	1
Description of how proposed program will address the identified community needs, in particular the needs of (primarily low-performing) students and working families	3	2
Program Design (Maximum 25 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
Range and type of program activities that will be offered and how those activities will improve student academic achievement and overall student success and align with the academic goals in Appendix D	2	1
Number of students and low-performing students that will be served at each site, grade-levels, average daily attendance	3	2
General schedule of operations for each proposed site is provided; the number of program days/hours are included and meet program minimums outlined in Appendix G	3	3
Staffing ratios alignment with the recommended instructor to student ratios outlined in Appendix G	2	2

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION & NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: RSU 67 (Lincoln Recreation Department)
DATE: 05/31/24

<p>Elements of high-quality programming:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Linkages to School Day • Strong Instructional Leadership • Safe and Appropriate Environment • Student-Driven Programming • Regular Attendees 	5	2
<p>All six (6) of the program goals for the 21st CCLC program have been addressed within Appendix D and include the necessary strategies, activities, and proposed outcomes in the areas of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Academic Improvement • Health and Wellness • Educational Enrichment • Parent Education and Family Engagement • Sustainability and Collaboration • Professional and Staff Development 	6	2
<p>All proposed outcomes in Appendix D match the required performance measures (percentages, numbers, frequencies, etc. are provided where requested) and appear realistic, given size and scope of the proposal</p>	4	2
<p>Program Management (Maximum 10 Points)</p>	Points Possible	Points Awarded
<p>Elements of program management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program Leadership • School Leadership Support • Staff and Professional Development • Communication/Information Dissemination • Transportation • Volunteers 	10	7
<p>Program Evaluation (Maximum 10 Points)</p>	Points Possible	Points Awarded
<p>Description of how the program(s) will be based on the following “measures of effectiveness”:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. be based upon an assessment of objective data regarding the need for before and after school (or summer recess) programs and activities in the schools and communities; ii. be based upon an established set of performance measures aimed at ensuring the availability of high-quality academic enrichment programs; iii. if appropriate, be based upon evidence-based research that the program or activity will help students meet the challenging State academic standards and any local academic standards; iv. ensure that measures of student success align with the regular academic program of the school and academic needs of participating students and include performance indicators and measures as determined by the state; and v. collect the data necessary for the measures of student success described in subparagraph (iv) above. 	4	2
<p>Periodic evaluation to assess the providers progress toward its goal of providing high-quality opportunities for academic enrichment</p>	3	2
<p>Results of a periodic evaluation of the proposed program will refine, improve, and strengthen the program and its performance measures as well as how and when the results of periodic evaluations will be made available to the public and used to build community support.</p>	3	2
Section II Total (Max. 55 Points)		32

Section III. Budget Proposal (38 Total Points)

<p>Budget Narrative and Budget Forms (Maximum 25 Points)</p>	Points Possible	Points Awarded
<p>Budget Narrative describes how items within the budget will support the achievement of program goals and performance measures outlined in Appendix D</p>	4	3
<p>Budget Narrative aligns with and provides an explanation of content in the budget forms</p>	3	3

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION & NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: RSU 67 (Lincoln Recreation Department)
DATE: 05/31/24

Items are addressed within the Budget Narrative: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Estimated cost per regular, low-performing student • Evidence is provided that there is a commitment of adequate resources for all participants • Fee structure is described, if applicable • Federal, State, and local program resources • Purpose of all expenditures has been described • In-kind contributions from partners that demonstrate the capacity to sustain programming 	6	3
Budget Forms – 001, 002, 003, 004, and 005: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are complete and align with the budget narrative • Illustrate that program transportation costs are shared, with the local school district contributing at least 35% of the overall annual transportation cost • Provide evidence that the requested amount is appropriate and reasonable for the size and scope of the project (most funds going towards expenses directly impacting programming for students) • Provide detailed line-item descriptions (e.g., hours worked per week, rate of pay, weeks per year) • Demonstrate a detailed and logical connection to program goals 	12	6
Capacity for Success and Sustainability (Maximum 13 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
Program advisory board member information has been provided and represents a diverse group of stakeholders	4	1
Sustainability plan, which describes how the community learning center(s) included within the proposal will continue to operate without 21 st CCLC program funding after the anticipated award period ends	5	2
Roles and commitment of key partners, including involvement with program design and implementation	4	4
Section III Total (Max. 38 points)		22

Section IV. Priority Points (7 Total Points)

Priority Points (Maximum 7 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
<u>Poverty Level:</u>		
Percentage of school population eligible for free and reduced-price lunch	Less than 45%	Between 45% and 59%
	Between 60% and 75%	Greater than 75%
Point Scale	0 Points	1 Point
	2 Points	3 Points
<u>ESEA Accountability Status:</u>		
ESEA accountability status of the school(s) included within the application	No school(s) eligible for “Tier 1”, “Tier 2”, or “Tier 3” support	One or more schools eligible for “Tier 1” or “Tier 2” support
	One or more schools eligible for “Tier 3” support	
Priority points	0 Points	1 Point
	2 Points	
<u>Other Need:</u>		
Level of evidence within the application	No Evidence	Moderate Evidence
	High Evidence	
Priority points	0 Points	1 Point
	2 Points	
Section V Total (Max. 7 points)		2
OFFICIAL SCORE (Max. 100 points)		56

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION & NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: RSU 67 (Lincoln Recreation Department)
DATE: 05/31/24

EVALUATION TEAM NOTES

Section II. Specifications of Work to be Performed	Points Possible: 55	Score: <u>32</u>
<p>Evaluation Team Comments:</p> <p>The planning process for the proposal spanned from February through March, with a total of 7 hours of planning time. The review team had difficulty in determining who was represented at planning meetings as only individual names and no affiliation information was provided. Overall, the planning process seemed quite minimal. The review team would have appreciated more of a narrative description of the bidder's planning process.</p> <p>The need for program response did not provide any real data to support the need for the 21st CCLC program. The bidder noted that parents have requested additional after school services for students but did not provide any sort of statistical data on things like poverty, student academic performance, or other indicators that would demonstrate the need for a local 21st CCLC program. The description of how the bidder would address the needs that were identified was also somewhat vague. The narrative provided read like more of a basic summary of what an afterschool program is as opposed to the specific programs and interventions the bidder is proposing to provide for students and families.</p> <p>The overall program design seemed limited and was largely focused on academic enrichment in mathematics. The review team noted that the bidder's response did not mention differentiation for students in multiple age ranges. The review team questioned the bidder's claim that all students in both of the proposed school sites were low-performing, as this would mean that all students in both schools are performing below grade-level expectations in math and/or literacy based on standardized assessments. Proposed instructional hours for both the school year and summer programs meet the minimum requirements of the RFP. The staff-to-student ratios fall within the ranges noted in Appendix G of the RFP. However, the review team noted the academic tutoring ratios were on the higher end of the allowable range.</p> <p>Regarding the connection to the school day, the bidder did not provide a clear picture of how needs or data will be communicated between school day and afterschool program staff. The bidder's response noted that the program director would be in communication with school staff but did not mention the process or frequency for this communication. The team wondered when and how such information would be communicated. In terms of program staffing, the goal is to hire certified teachers or paraprofessionals if certified teachers cannot be found. The bidder will leverage its RTI system and implement an "invitation model" to prioritize the enrollment of students most in need of additional supports. The team would've liked a bit more detail on this model and how it would support the regular attendance of students. The review team did appreciate that staff would receive training on zones of regulation and conflict resolution.</p> <p>In Appendix D of the proposal, the strategies and activities were often minimal. The review team questioned how many of the goals would be achievable through the strategies and activities that were provided. It was difficult to determine how reasonable the academic goals presented were, as the bidder did not provide any sort of baseline student achievement information earlier in the proposal. The team recommends increasing the dosage (hours, frequency, etc.) of various types of programming in order to ensure students are engaged and excited about continuing to attend the program. In many instances, the bidder proposed goals that were different than what was required in the RFP document. For example, the bidder proposed to measure improvements in student attitudes rather than provide the number and frequency of opportunities for students to participate in physical activity. There are many similar examples of this throughout Appendix D of the proposal, which do not align with the requirements of the RFP.</p> <p>The narrative provided clearly outlined skills and a strong plan for the hiring of a program director. The primary support from the school district would be the curriculum coordinator and school administrators. Plans for sharing information involved updating the school district's website and presenting at an upcoming school board meeting (if awarded). Student transportation will include bussing home for students attending the after-school program. However, it is noted the narrative provided made no mention of transportation for the summer program. The response around professional development plans for staff was also limited. The district's current process for recruiting, vetting, and training volunteers would be used.</p> <p>The proposed evaluation plans appear to include relevant data. However, there seems to be a large focus on academics. The overall process for evaluation work was somewhat difficult to follow. The narrative provided indicated that the work would occur 3-times per year in collaboration with the school district. However, there wasn't much in the form of a clearly laid out plan for what data would be reviewed at what times. There was mention of regular self-assessment work in addition to the collection of survey data. The results of the evaluation work are noted as being shared with the "board". The review team was not clear on whether this was the school board or the program's advisory board. Some more specific details and timeline information would have been helpful here.</p>		

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION & NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: RSU 67 (Lincoln Recreation Department)
DATE: 05/31/24

Section III. Budget Proposal	Points Possible: 38	Score: <u>22</u>
<p>Evaluation Team Comments:</p> <p>The budget narrative does not specify the number of RLP students to be served but does indicate a cost of \$2,688.00 per RLP student. The narrative was a bit confusing around whether program fees would be charged to students and families. The bidder indicated that no fees would be charged for the program, but later noted that specific fees may be charged for certain types of activities. It was unclear to the review team what this meant and whether fees would or would not be charged. The review team also had some questions around the design of summer programming through the 21st CCLC grant as compared to what is already going on within the school district. It was unclear in the budget narrative whether the existing funding for summer programming was expected to be permanent. If not, the team had concerns around how the required summer program would continue to be funded in future years. The review team did note that some grant funding would be freed up in future years once initial (year 1) investments in supplies and equipment were paid for.</p> <p>Transportation costs for the program are noted as being \$24,800, with \$9,800 (39%) being contributed by the school district. However, on Forms 002 and 005, the \$9,800 transportation funding amount is not articulated as coming from RSU 67. The review team would have liked to see this more explicitly on these forms. The review team found it odd that Form 001 included no in-kind contributions. On Form 003, it is also noted that hourly rates for both the program director and summer tutors seemed quite high at roughly \$45.00 per hour and that there is notable disparity between wages for different positions. It is also noted that the program director position was only established for 36 weeks during the year, which does not meet the year-round (52-week) requirement outlined in the RFP for this position. Additionally, the review team had some concerns around the supply and equipment budget in Forms 004 and 005. Form 004 includes no equipment purchases, while Form 005 includes over \$56,000 in supplies. Much of the description of supply items noted in the proposal includes items that would meet the definition of equipment in the RFP (i.e. computer devices) and should have been correctly budgeted for on Form 004. Additionally, Form 005 (line 15) includes a description of administrative costs but has no funding attached to it. Overall, the team also expressed concerns around supplanting with the requested funds, such as the purchase of a new SEL curriculum. If the cost of the curriculum would also cover use by school day programming, then it would not be allowable under the 21st CCLC grant.</p> <p>The program advisory board is noted as only having two current members (director of curriculum and director of parks & recreation), with two more members marked as "TBD". It was noted that there were no building administrators, teachers, parents, or other community partners included on the advisory board. It would have been nice to see more individuals involved in the ongoing development and sustainability work for this program. The overall response regarding sustainability planning was a bit vague. There was mention of exploring fees for services and other ways to raise funds (other grants, etc.) to support the long-term implementation of the program. However, there was no real timeline or action steps presented as to how the program would be sustained beyond the life of the 21st CCLC grant. The roles and commitments of both the school district and lead partner organization are clearly outlined.</p>		
Section IV. Priority Points	Points Possible: 7	Score: <u>2</u>
<p>Evaluation Team Comments:</p> <p>The average free and reduced lunch rate of the school(s) included within the proposal totaled 43%.</p> <p>One or more Tier 3 schools have been included in the proposal.</p> <p>Overall, the proposal provided a low level of evidence for other need, citing poverty levels, and increase in drug use, and limited afterschool care options for families within the communities served. That said, there was not really any data to substantiate these areas of need.</p>		

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION & NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: RSU 85 MSAD 19 (Lubec Community Outreach Center)
DATE: 05/09/24

Instructions: The purpose of this form is to record all evaluation notes and scoring that is obtained through consensus discussions among the full evaluation team for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. The RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator should complete this form and maintain the only copy. This form should reflect the full team's consensus evaluations, and this form is not meant to take the place of individual evaluation notes, which are still required from each member of the evaluation team. A separate form is available for individual evaluation notes. Please submit a copy of this document to the Division of Purchases as part of your contract award selection documents.

DEPARTMENT NAME: Education
NAME OF RFP COORDINATOR: Travis Doughty
NAMES OF EVALUATORS: Jessica Francis, Luba Greene, Rachelle Tome

POINT SUMMARY

Section I. General Information (Pass/Fail)

Required Item	Pass	Fail	Comments
1. Cover Sheet	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	-
2. Debarment Certification Form	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	-
3. Abstract	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	-
4. Program Demographics	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	-
5. Partners	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	-

Section II. Specifications of Work to Be Performed (55 Total Points)

Planning (Maximum 4 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
Description of the planning process used to submit the application	2	1
Planning meetings and collaborative writing sessions, including multiple parties	2	1
Need for Program (Maximum 6 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
Evaluation of community needs and available resources for the community learning center(s)	3	2
Description of how proposed program will address the identified community needs, in particular the needs of (primarily low-performing) students and working families	3	2
Program Design (Maximum 25 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
Range and type of program activities that will be offered and how those activities will improve student academic achievement and overall student success and align with the academic goals in Appendix D	2	2
Number of students and low-performing students that will be served at each site, grade-levels, average daily attendance	3	2
General schedule of operations for each proposed site is provided; the number of program days/hours are included and meet program minimums outlined in Appendix G	3	3
Staffing ratios alignment with the recommended instructor to student ratios outlined in Appendix G	2	2

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION & NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: RSU 85 MSAD 19 (Lubec Community Outreach Center)
DATE: 05/09/24

Elements of high-quality programming: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Linkages to School Day • Strong Instructional Leadership • Safe and Appropriate Environment • Student-Driven Programming • Regular Attendees 	5	4
All six (6) of the program goals for the 21 st CCLC program have been addressed within Appendix D and include the necessary strategies, activities, and proposed outcomes in the areas of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Academic Improvement • Health and Wellness • Educational Enrichment • Parent Education and Family Engagement • Sustainability and Collaboration • Professional and Staff Development 	6	6
All proposed outcomes in Appendix D match the required performance measures (percentages, numbers, frequencies, etc. are provided where requested) and appear realistic, given size and scope of the proposal	4	2
Program Management (Maximum 10 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
Elements of program management: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program Leadership • School Leadership Support • Staff and Professional Development • Communication/Information Dissemination • Transportation • Volunteers 	10	6
Program Evaluation (Maximum 10 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
Description of how the program(s) will be based on the following “measures of effectiveness”: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. be based upon an assessment of objective data regarding the need for before and after school (or summer recess) programs and activities in the schools and communities; ii. be based upon an established set of performance measures aimed at ensuring the availability of high-quality academic enrichment programs; iii. if appropriate, be based upon evidence-based research that the program or activity will help students meet the challenging State academic standards and any local academic standards; iv. ensure that measures of student success align with the regular academic program of the school and academic needs of participating students and include performance indicators and measures as determined by the state; and v. collect the data necessary for the measures of student success described in subparagraph (iv) above. 	4	2
Periodic evaluation to assess the providers progress toward its goal of providing high-quality opportunities for academic enrichment	3	3
Results of a periodic evaluation of the proposed program will refine, improve, and strengthen the program and its performance measures as well as how and when the results of periodic evaluations will be made available to the public and used to build community support.	3	3
Section II Total (Max. 55 Points)		41

Section III. Budget Proposal (38 Total Points)

Budget Narrative and Budget Forms (Maximum 25 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
Budget Narrative describes how items within the budget will support the achievement of program goals and performance measures outlined in Appendix D	4	4
Budget Narrative aligns with and provides an explanation of content in the budget forms	3	3

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION & NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: RSU 85 MSAD 19 (Lubec Community Outreach Center)
DATE: 05/09/24

Items are addressed within the Budget Narrative: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Estimated cost per regular, low-performing student • Evidence is provided that there is a commitment of adequate resources for all participants • Fee structure is described, if applicable • Federal, State, and local program resources • Purpose of all expenditures has been described • In-kind contributions from partners that demonstrate the capacity to sustain programming 	6	6
Budget Forms – 001, 002, 003, 004, and 005: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are complete and align with the budget narrative • Illustrate that program transportation costs are shared, with the local school district contributing at least 35% of the overall annual transportation cost • Provide evidence that the requested amount is appropriate and reasonable for the size and scope of the project (most funds going towards expenses directly impacting programming for students) • Provide detailed line-item descriptions (e.g., hours worked per week, rate of pay, weeks per year) • Demonstrate a detailed and logical connection to program goals 	12	9
Capacity for Success and Sustainability (Maximum 13 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
Program advisory board member information has been provided and represents a diverse group of stakeholders	4	4
Sustainability plan, which describes how the community learning center(s) included within the proposal will continue to operate without 21 st CCLC program funding after the anticipated award period ends	5	4
Roles and commitment of key partners, including involvement with program design and implementation	4	4
Section III Total (Max. 38 points)		34

Section IV. Priority Points (7 Total Points)

Priority Points (Maximum 7 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
<u>Poverty Level:</u>		
Percentage of school population eligible for free and reduced-price lunch	Less than 45%	Between 45% and 59%
	Between 60% and 75%	Greater than 75%
Point Scale	0 Points	1 Point
	2 Points	3 Points
	3	2
<u>ESEA Accountability Status:</u>		
ESEA accountability status of the school(s) included within the application	No school(s) eligible for “Tier 1”, “Tier 2”, or “Tier 3” support	One or more schools eligible for “Tier 1” or “Tier 2” support
	One or more schools eligible for “Tier 3” support	
Priority points	0 Points	1 Point
	2 Points	2 Points
	2	0
<u>Other Need:</u>		
Level of evidence within the application	No Evidence	Moderate Evidence
	High Evidence	
Priority points	0 Points	1 Point
	2 Points	2 Points
	2	1
Section V Total (Max. 7 points)		3
OFFICIAL SCORE (Max. 100 points)		78

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION & NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: RSU 85 MSAD 19 (Lubec Community Outreach Center)
DATE: 05/09/24

EVALUATION TEAM NOTES

Section II. Specifications of Work to be Performed	Points Possible: 55	Score: <u>41</u>
<p>Evaluation Team Comments:</p> <p>The overall planning process spanned from January to April, totaling 4 meetings and 6 hours of planning time. The meeting participants were not well-defined, making it difficult for the review team to determine who was involved in the planning process. It is noted, however, that the planning process included a meeting with parents that had significant attendance.</p> <p>The bidder's needs assessment noted a number of challenges, including high rates of single-parent households, family dynamics complicated by addiction, and truancy among students. A lack of reliable internet access and transportation were also noted as challenges. However, the only real data points provided in this section of the proposal had to do with poverty rate. The review team questioned the lack of data around the academic needs of students. In particular, the review team would have appreciated additional data on the needs of students related to mathematics and literacy achievement. The proposal notes that the programming currently provided at the community center is fee-based and that it could move to a model of free programming with a 21st CCLC grant award. This would serve to help more families access services, but the review team questioned how the 21st CCLC grant would be supplemental to existing programs and services.</p> <p>The proposed program design included a good mix of academic and enrichment programming, covering areas like STEM, cooking, horticulture, physical activity, arts, music, and more. The review team noted that the bidder intends to serve 50 students annually, 100% of whom will reach RLP status. The team questioned this as schools don't typically have 100% of their students performing below grade level expectations. The team also had concerns around serving 100% of the students enrolled in the school for 30+ days throughout the year. It was unclear if the count of 50 students was the total school population or a subset of students within the school. The proposed scheduled for the school year and summer programs both meet and exceed the minimum requirements set forth in the RFP. The staff-to-student ratios are also within the range noted in Appendix G of the RFP and are noted as being on the lower end of the allowable range.</p> <p>The LCOC program is located in the same building as the school and is already established and trusted within the community. This allows for easy access to and collaboration with school day staff. Students enrolled in the program would also have easy access to a school counselor. As LCOC is a licensed childcare provider, staff working the program would be required to participate in ongoing professional development. Students appear to have autonomy and choice in terms of what they participate in during program time, but the review team questioned the extent to which students had input into the design of program activities and offerings. The proposal included some innovative ideas around engaging the parents and families of participating students, further supporting the regular attendance of students within the program.</p> <p>In Appendix D of the proposal, the strategies and activities tied well into STEM, nutrition, and wellness themes evident earlier in the proposal. However, the proposed academic improvement targets were noted as being quite low at only 5%. While no information on student academic assessment data was provided earlier in the proposal, the review team felt these improvement targets could have been much higher and still very achievable. The team felt it was odd that while the program had high level goals around partnerships and fundraising, that the participation in the program's advisory board was limited to only six members over the life of the grant. Typically, when building partnerships with outside organizations, it is best practice to include representative(s) from those organizations on the program's advisory board. The team felt that this was a missed opportunity for demonstrating growth over the 4 years of the proposed grant.</p> <p>The bidder clearly outlines the skills they would want in their program director but did not specify any sort of educational level or qualifications that would be sought in a candidate. The response provided indicated the program director would also be the site coordinator for the program. There was an emphasis on also hiring from within the local community. The review team noted that with LCOC being an existing program, it would have been nice to know a bit more around the connection between the proposed program director in connection with the existing leadership structure for LCOC. There appears to be strong partnership and coordination between the bidder and community organization. However, there was no mention of any collaborative professional development with the school district. Multiple methods of communication have been identified, including take home packets, online postings, and publications in local newspapers. There is a range of community partners that the program can pull volunteers from. However, the review team would've liked a more clearly defined process for vetting and onboarding individuals to volunteer in the program. The proposal notes that transportation services seemed to be limited to field trips and that transportation to and from the program for both the school year and summer programs would be the responsibility of parents and families. This was noted as a limitation of the school district and something that was being worked on. However, the review team worried this would not meet the basic requirements of the grant. If funded, this program would need to ensure safe transportation for students and families who would need it so as to comply with grant requirements and not create a significant barrier to participation for students and families without reliable transportation.</p>		

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION & NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: RSU 85 MSAD 19 (Lubec Community Outreach Center)
DATE: 05/09/24

In terms of program evaluation, the bidder provided a somewhat vague response as to what data would be collected for evaluation purposes. The response provided included mention of academic, participation, and survey data, without really further describing the specific data that would be collected. For example, the review team would have expected to see at least the specific assessment data to be reviewed included in this portion of the proposal. That said, the review team did like the innovative approach of planning out a peer review with another 21st CCLC program in order to learn more about best practices and things that could be incorporated into their own 21st CCLC work. Evaluation work is noted as being completed on a quarterly basis in collaboration with school day teachers. The results of their evaluation work are planned to be shared, within 30 days of completion, with various key stakeholders through a mix of online and printed materials.

Section III. Budget Proposal

Points Possible: **38**

Score: **34**

Evaluation Team Comments:

The budget narrative aligned well with the goals established in Appendix D of the proposal. The narrative also indicated that the program would serve 50 RLP students annually, resulting in a cost per RLP student of \$2,683.00. The budget also clearly outlined the other cash and in-kind contributions that would support the implementation of the program. The review team really appreciated the process of fundraising used by the bidder. In terms of program fees, the bidder notes that no fees would be charged to students or families for the proposed program.

The budget proposal did not include any funding from the school district to support the costs of transportation. While the program is currently proposing limited transportation services, the school district would still be responsible for meeting the 35% minimum toward the annual transportation costs for the program. The review team noted this was missing from the budget forms. Additionally, the review team had serious concerns as to how the proposed budget would accommodate transportation costs to and from the program once required transportation services would be put in place. The other proposed costs seemed reasonable in terms of the size and scope of the program. The budget forms provided adequate detail for the review team to understand the intended purchases under each budget line.

The program advisory board includes 6 members, which includes the school principal, representative from the community organization, parents, and teachers. The review team questioned why some of the other partners listed in other portions of the proposal have not been approached to serve on the advisory board. It is recommended that this be considered as a way to grow the advisory board and help achieve its goals. The sustainability plan includes a mix of ways to fund the program, including municipal and private funding, exploring AmeriCorps grants, etc. There is evidence of a strong history partnership between the bidder and lead partner organizations.

Section IV. Priority Points

Points Possible: **7**

Score: **3**

Evaluation Team Comments:

The average free and reduced lunch rate of the school(s) included within the proposal totaled 64%.

No Tier 1, 2, or 3 schools have been included in the proposal.

Overall, the proposal provided a moderate level of evidence for other need, citing high rates of poverty, single-parent households, and concerns around student truancy. Illness and addiction were also referenced in a few places within the proposal.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION & NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: Westbrook Public Schools (Intercultural Community Center)
DATE: 05/09/24

Instructions: *The purpose of this form is to record all evaluation notes and scoring that is obtained through consensus discussions among the full evaluation team for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. The RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator should complete this form and maintain the only copy. This form should reflect the full team's consensus evaluations, and this form is not meant to take the place of individual evaluation notes, which are still required from each member of the evaluation team. A separate form is available for individual evaluation notes. Please submit a copy of this document to the Division of Purchases as part of your contract award selection documents.*

DEPARTMENT NAME: Education
NAME OF RFP COORDINATOR: Travis Doughty
NAMES OF EVALUATORS: Jessica Francis, Luba Greene, Rachelle Tome

POINT SUMMARY

Section I. General Information (Pass/Fail)

Required Item	Pass	Fail	Comments
1. Cover Sheet	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	-
2. Debarment Certification Form	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	-
3. Abstract	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	-
4. Program Demographics	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	-
5. Partners	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	-

Section II. Specifications of Work to Be Performed (55 Total Points)

Planning (Maximum 4 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
Description of the planning process used to submit the application	2	2
Planning meetings and collaborative writing sessions, including multiple parties	2	1
Need for Program (Maximum 6 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
Evaluation of community needs and available resources for the community learning center(s)	3	2
Description of how proposed program will address the identified community needs, in particular the needs of (primarily low-performing) students and working families	3	3
Program Design (Maximum 25 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
Range and type of program activities that will be offered and how those activities will improve student academic achievement and overall student success and align with the academic goals in Appendix D	2	2
Number of students and low-performing students that will be served at each site, grade-levels, average daily attendance	3	2
General schedule of operations for each proposed site is provided; the number of program days/hours are included and meet program minimums outlined in Appendix G	3	3
Staffing ratios alignment with the recommended instructor to student ratios outlined in Appendix G	2	2

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION & NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: Westbrook Public Schools (Intercultural Community Center)
DATE: 05/09/24

Elements of high-quality programming: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Linkages to School Day • Strong Instructional Leadership • Safe and Appropriate Environment • Student-Driven Programming • Regular Attendees 	5	5
All six (6) of the program goals for the 21 st CCLC program have been addressed within Appendix D and include the necessary strategies, activities, and proposed outcomes in the areas of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Academic Improvement • Health and Wellness • Educational Enrichment • Parent Education and Family Engagement • Sustainability and Collaboration • Professional and Staff Development 	6	4
All proposed outcomes in Appendix D match the required performance measures (percentages, numbers, frequencies, etc. are provided where requested) and appear realistic, given size and scope of the proposal	4	2
Program Management (Maximum 10 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
Elements of program management: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program Leadership • School Leadership Support • Staff and Professional Development • Communication/Information Dissemination • Transportation • Volunteers 	10	8
Program Evaluation (Maximum 10 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
Description of how the program(s) will be based on the following “measures of effectiveness”: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. be based upon an assessment of objective data regarding the need for before and after school (or summer recess) programs and activities in the schools and communities; ii. be based upon an established set of performance measures aimed at ensuring the availability of high-quality academic enrichment programs; iii. if appropriate, be based upon evidence-based research that the program or activity will help students meet the challenging State academic standards and any local academic standards; iv. ensure that measures of student success align with the regular academic program of the school and academic needs of participating students and include performance indicators and measures as determined by the state; and v. collect the data necessary for the measures of student success described in subparagraph (iv) above. 	4	2
Periodic evaluation to assess the providers progress toward its goal of providing high-quality opportunities for academic enrichment	3	3
Results of a periodic evaluation of the proposed program will refine, improve, and strengthen the program and its performance measures as well as how and when the results of periodic evaluations will be made available to the public and used to build community support.	3	3
Section II Total (Max. 55 Points)		44

Section III. Budget Proposal (38 Total Points)

Budget Narrative and Budget Forms (Maximum 25 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
Budget Narrative describes how items within the budget will support the achievement of program goals and performance measures outlined in Appendix D	4	4
Budget Narrative aligns with and provides an explanation of content in the budget forms	3	3

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION & NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: Westbrook Public Schools (Intercultural Community Center)
DATE: 05/09/24

Items are addressed within the Budget Narrative: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Estimated cost per regular, low-performing student • Evidence is provided that there is a commitment of adequate resources for all participants • Fee structure is described, if applicable • Federal, State, and local program resources • Purpose of all expenditures has been described • In-kind contributions from partners that demonstrate the capacity to sustain programming 	6	4
Budget Forms – 001, 002, 003, 004, and 005: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are complete and align with the budget narrative • Illustrate that program transportation costs are shared, with the local school district contributing at least 35% of the overall annual transportation cost • Provide evidence that the requested amount is appropriate and reasonable for the size and scope of the project (most funds going towards expenses directly impacting programming for students) • Provide detailed line-item descriptions (e.g., hours worked per week, rate of pay, weeks per year) • Demonstrate a detailed and logical connection to program goals 	12	10
Capacity for Success and Sustainability (Maximum 13 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
Program advisory board member information has been provided and represents a diverse group of stakeholders	4	4
Sustainability plan, which describes how the community learning center(s) included within the proposal will continue to operate without 21 st CCLC program funding after the anticipated award period ends	5	3
Roles and commitment of key partners, including involvement with program design and implementation	4	4
Section III Total (Max. 38 points)		32

Section IV. Priority Points (7 Total Points)

Priority Points (Maximum 7 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded
<u>Poverty Level:</u>		
Percentage of school population eligible for free and reduced-price lunch	Less than 45%	Between 45% and 59%
	Between 60% and 75%	Greater than 75%
Point Scale	0 Points	1 Point
	2 Points	3 Points
<u>ESEA Accountability Status:</u>		
ESEA accountability status of the school(s) included within the application	No school(s) eligible for “Tier 1”, “Tier 2”, or “Tier 3” support	One or more schools eligible for “Tier 1” or “Tier 2” support
	One or more schools eligible for “Tier 3” support	
Priority points	0 Points	1 Point
	2 Points	
<u>Other Need:</u>		
Level of evidence within the application	No Evidence	Moderate Evidence
	High Evidence	
Priority points	0 Points	1 Point
	2 Points	
Section V Total (Max. 7 points)		4
OFFICIAL SCORE (Max. 100 points)		80

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION & NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: Westbrook Public Schools (Intercultural Community Center)
DATE: 05/09/24

EVALUATION TEAM NOTES

Section II. Specifications of Work to be Performed	Points Possible: 55	Score: 44
<p>Evaluation Team Comments:</p> <p>The planning process for the proposal spanned from February to April, with over 60 hours of planning time. Planning meetings included mostly collaboration between the school district and lead partner organization. However, the review team noted it was often difficult to determine what sort of role each of the planning team members had. It was also not evident that parents, students, or other community partners were involved in the planning process.</p> <p>The needs assessment presented seemed to focus heavily on the academic needs of multi-lingual (ML) students. The needs assessment noted the school district having the 4th highest population of ML students in the State of Maine. There are also limited opportunities for middle school students in the Westbrook area to participate in after-school programming. The bidder noted that if the program were to go away, there would be no academic support after school for middle school ML students. The review team would have appreciated some more specific and varied data (i.e. poverty rates, academic assessment data, WIDA sores, etc.) to demonstrate the needs that were identified by the bidder. For the needs that were identified, the bidder provided a sound plan for how the bidder would address those needs through the delivery of the proposed programming.</p> <p>The range and type of programming involved project-based curriculum, with student-led topics and the opportunity for student autonomy and choice. The review team appreciated the inclusion of age-appropriate programming that serves to address social and mental health concerns. The proposal includes services for 58 RLP students out of 404 eligible students. The review team questioned why no historical data from the 2020-2021 grant cycle was unavailable. Even with staff turnover, some form of program data should have been available. The school year and summer program operational hours meet and exceed the minimum requirements outlined in the RFP. Additionally, the staff-to-student ratios fall within the ranges noted in Appendix G of the RFP. The review team also appreciated how the staff-to-student ratios were on the lower end of the allowable range for targeted academic support.</p> <p>Regular meetings are held between middle school leadership and staff at the community partner organization, which include conversations around planning, testing data, etc. Any behavior or other incidents that occur during the afterschool program are communicated with school day staff within 48 hours. The program includes intentional focus on physical and emotional health of students and provides spaces and resources to help students decompress and center themselves. Students can provide input as to the clubs and activities offered through the program. In terms of encouraging regular attendance, the program implements a rotating schedule of guest speakers, field trips, etc. Additionally, after a student reaches 30 days of attendance, program staff communicate with parents thanking them for their child’s attendance.</p> <p>In Appendix D of the proposal, the goals for academic improvement seemed reasonable, but somewhat ambitious. The review team felt the strategies and activities were often vague and did not provide a clear picture of what the program would be doing to support the achievement of established goals. There were also other areas where goals seemed a bit lower than they should be. For example, opportunities for physical activity were noted as taking place once per week. The team felt this was notably lower than it should be, particularly for a program focused on serving middle school students. Similarly, the review team wondered why mental health programming for students would only occur monthly, when support in this area was noted above as being a particular area of needed support. Under the family engagement area, the review team felt the goals were also very low. For example, some areas had goals with less than 10 parents attending events for the year. That said, the review team did appreciate the partnership with adult education to carry out some of its family engagement work. Overall, the proposed outcomes were addressed, but the goals either seemed too rigorous or not rigorous enough. The review team questioned why the “bar” was set so low in some of the proposed outcome areas.</p> <p>The proposal described the skills that would be sought in a program director but did not specify any sort of qualifications that would be required for the person that fulfills the role. For a renewal proposal, the review team questioned why there was no mention of an existing program director. It was unclear if someone was in the current role or if a new person is planned to be hired. The proposal noted that the program director meets regularly with the school principal, and that school staff collaborates with the community organization to review student data, program finances, etc. Outside of required training for working with school children, professional development was somewhat limited and seemed to be something staff had to opt into. The review team would have liked to see more required, shared professional development for staff on important topics related to positive youth development. The program implements a volunteer management system to recruit and vet volunteers. The program provides transportation both during the school year and summer. However, the review team questioned the structure of transportation where the school district pays the community organization for the use of their vehicles. This seemed like an odd arrangement. The plans around communication were sound and included translation services to ensure accessibility for all students and families.</p>		

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION & NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: Westbrook Public Schools (Intercultural Community Center)
DATE: 05/09/24

In terms of program evaluation, the response provided by the bidder was a bit vague. The data sources were not clearly defined, and the review team did not have a good picture of what data would be reviewed by the bidder. The evaluation plan notes meeting to evaluate and review the program three times per year. There is also mention of quarterly reporting to the program's advisory board. Results of evaluation work would also be shared widely with stakeholders to help the bidder determine appropriate action steps to address areas of concern. Overall, the framework for evaluation seemed to be in place, but the proposal did not provide a clear plan of what specific data would be reviewed during the evaluation process.

Section III. Budget Proposal

Points Possible: **38**

Score: **32**

Evaluation Team Comments:

The budget narrative looked to be in alignment with the program goals in Appendix D and the information provided within the budget forms. The narrative specified that the program would serve 58 RLP students annually at a cost of \$3,000 per RLP student. However, the actual cost per RLP student based on the \$175,000 request amounts to \$3,017.24, which exceeds the maximum cost per RLP student allowed in the RFP. The bidder indicated that program fees will not be charged to students or families for participation in the program. Funding from the school district is noted within the budget, as well as a general statement around other income from other organizations. The review team would have appreciated some specifics regarding the cash funding coming from various partner organizations mentioned in the budget narrative.

The budget forms indicate that 100% of the transportation funding for the program (\$20,000) is being covered by the school district. It was unclear to the review team whether this amount was specific to summer programming or the total costs of the year. If for summer only, as described earlier in the proposal, this amount seemed high for roughly 6 weeks of programming. The team also noted that the bidder seemed to have incorrectly budgeted for "transportation associates" on Form 003 instead of including these as grant-funded transportation costs on Form 005, line 13. On Form 003, the review team questioned whether the 5 instructional staff budgeted for in the proposal would be sufficient to meet the staffing needs for the program and to maintain the staff-to-student ratios noted earlier. On Form 005, the review team would have also liked more concrete descriptions of what funds would be used for—particularly the \$10,000 set aside for program supplies.

The program advisory board is comprised of 15 members and includes representation from both the school district and community organization, as well as parents, community members and other partner organizations. There was also mention of the bidder ensuring gender and racial diversity of their advisory board, which the review team appreciated. The sustainability plan includes mention of the systems and operational requirements needed for the program to continue. However, there was no real mention of the need for funding to continue the systems and operational requirements mentioned. Within the sustainability plan, the team would've liked to see more of a timeline with milestones for each year of the grant. The roles and commitments of the two partnering organizations have been clearly outlined.

Section IV. Priority Points

Points Possible: **7**

Score: **4**

Evaluation Team Comments:

The average free and reduced lunch rate of the school(s) included within the proposal totaled 66%.

One or more Tier 2 schools have been included in the proposal.

Overall, the proposal provided a moderate level of evidence for other need, citing poverty levels and high immigrant and ML populations in the school community. There was also mention of a lack of other available academic support opportunities after school.

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Boys & Girls Club of Kennebec Valley and RSU 12
DATE: 4/15/24
EVALUATOR NAME: Jessie Francis
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Instructions: *The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by **individual** evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is **required** that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department's RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.*

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Appendix A – Proposal Cover Page

1. Pass

Appendix B – Debarment, Performance, and Non-Collusion Certification

2. Pass

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

I. General Information

- a. Abstract*
- b. Program Demographics*
- c. Partners*

a) Abstract

- **P:** BGCKV & MSAD11 partnership operated 21stCCLC programming 2003-2013, 2015-2024.
- **P:** Expansion to 50 students

b) **Program Demographics**

- 150 students, 121 RLPs, 50 RLPs per day, 30 students with special education
- Cost/RLP= \$2,685.95
- **I:** 61 parents served is 41% of all students served, seems low?

c) Partners

- Four partners listed—RSU 12, MSAD 11, Health Communities of the Capital Area + Prime

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Boys & Girls Club of Kennebec Valley and RSU 12
DATE: 4/15/24
EVALUATOR NAME: Jessie Francis
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget
II. Specifications of Work to be Performed
1. Planning
2. Need for Program
3. Program Design
4. Program Management
5. Program Evaluation

1. Planning

- a. **Q:** Planning period 1/16-3/25 but planning summary indicates MSAD and RSU 12 worked together before the funding.
- b. **Q:** I don't see where the superintendent of MSAD 11 was engaged in planning. The way the partnership is described implies that MSAD 11 is involved in this application but nowhere is it detailed nor is there clarity on if MSAD 11 is involved.
 - i. **Q:** There are three individuals listed in the planning calls who are not described elsewhere in the application.
 - 1. A google search indicates Deb Taylor and Angela Hardy may be Directors of Curriculum at RSU 12 and MSAD 11; unclear who Meg Bowdoin is.
 - ii. **Q:** Principals of identified elementary schools sign the application but are not engaged in any of the planning

2. Need for Program

- a. **P:** Data to support program need described (below)
- b. **I:** Demographics of schools
 - i. Gardner Regional Middle School: 30% FPL, households below poverty line, 68% did not meet NEWA testing standards
 - ii. Chelsea Elementary: 65% did not meet NEWA testing standards
 - iii. Whitefield: 47% FPL, rural, 60% did not meet NEWA testing standards, households below poverty line
- c. **P:** Outcomes from current 21st CCLC programming by prime = 40% increased reading scores, 63% increased math scores, and improved classroom behavior and classroom engagement.

3. Program Design:

- a. **Program Description**

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Boys & Girls Club of Kennebec Valley and RSU 12
DATE: 4/15/24
EVALUATOR NAME: Jessie Francis
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

- i. **P:** Building on what is working in an existing 21stCCLC program
- ii. **P:** 130 days of programming
- iii. **I:** Sandra M. Prescott Clubhouse slated to have significantly longer hours (3.5 in school, 11 hours in summer per day). I would have liked the applicant to speak about this and the need for this.
- iv. **P:** Appropriate staffing ratios, lower ratio for enrichment and recreational activities
- v. **N:** Program demographics section indicates 50 RLPs per day, this section indicates 84 RLPs per day. Which is it?

b. Elements of High Quality Programming:

- i. **P:** Program will have access to curriculum and assessment data
- ii. **P:** Some teachers will be current district teachers, including some that have been involved for 15 years
- iii. **P:** PD-- All staff trained on workplace policies, first aid, CPR, quarterly PD opportunities
- iv. **P:** State licensing regulations references
- v. **P:** CACFP program embedded
- vi. **P:** Program quality assessments through Yourh Program Quality Assessment and Boys & Girls Club of America National Youth Outcomes Indicator survey
- vii. **P:** Daily student programming choice and program surveys planned
- viii. **Q:** Attendance section speaks to how they will promote attendance but program demographics section indicates 50 attendees per day (41%) and Program Description section indicates 68% attendance daily

c. Goals

- i. **Q:** Interesting that they indicate goals at only 15-30% improved math scores when they describe 63% increase math scores in previous outcomes. That seems like a low bar to set. Same with reading scores—previous outcomes listed in the “Need for Program” section at 40% and goal set at 15% in Year 1 and 30% in Year 4.

4. Program Management

- a. **P:** CLC Director has been working with 21stCCLC for 19 years
- b. **P:** Mentions Superintendent and Directors of Curriculum from both districts. Partner with school districts for training.

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Boys & Girls Club of Kennebec Valley and RSU 12
DATE: 4/15/24
EVALUATOR NAME: Jessie Francis
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

- c. **P:** Transportation provided by MSAD 11 and RSU 12.
- d. **P:** Volunteer system embedded within Prime; engagement with JMG, will meet Maine childcare licensing requirements and operates a summer “counselor in training” program.
- e. **Q:** It would be helpful to understand staffing by site; the budget supports enough staff but it is not clear in this section how many staff will be where.

5. Program Evaluation

- a. **P:** Multiple assessment data points identified.
- b. **Q:** Not a lot of info about what they’ll do with the data other than obtain it. “design assessment methods and evaluation techniques that will determine whether or not students have achieved enrichment outcomes...”

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

III. Budget Proposal

- 1. Budget Narrative*
- 2. Budget Forms*
- 3. Capacity for Success & Sustainability*

1. Budget narrative

- **P:** No fees for school-year programming
- **I:** sliding scale fees for summer at BGCKV (11 hour day program); free at Whitefield and Chelsea. Fee set to align with DHHS subsidy rate for childcare.
 - **Q:** Can families claim subsidy?
 - **P:** Also scholarship available

2. Budget Forms

- **P:** Good amount of in-kind from partners (29% of budget)
- **P:** Braiding in summer food program to support meals
- **P:** 66% Transportation costs provided by both partner districts
- **Q/N:** 25,000 for family evening events. Would like more information on what this is and what they’ll spend this money on. No information is included in the Budget narrative on this.

3. Capacity for Success & Sustainability

- **P:** 15-member board from various backgrounds

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Boys & Girls Club of Kennebec Valley and RSU 12
DATE: 4/15/24
EVALUATOR NAME: Jessie Francis
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

- **N:** As noted above, no where in the application is MSAD's 11 Superintendent/school district leadership engagement in this application or its sustainability plan clear.

Priority Points

1. *Poverty Level*
2. *ESEA Accountability Status*
3. *Other Need*

4. Pending info from DOE

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Boys & Girls Club of Kennebec Valley
DATE: April 19, 2024
EVALUATOR NAME: Luba Greene
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Instructions: *The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by **individual** evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is **required** that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department's RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.*

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Appendix A – Proposal Cover Page

- Expansion

Appendix B – Debarment, Performance, and Non-Collusion Certification

- no notes

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

- I. General Information*
 - a. Abstract*
 - b. Program Demographics*
 - c. Partners*

- b. Program Demographics: 3 schools, 2=grades 2-8, 1=grades 6-8
*Positives: numbers being served seems attainable, strong number of parents to be served
 - c. Partners:
*Positives: already existing partnership

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

- II. Specifications of Work to be Performed*
 - 1. Planning*
 - 2. Need for Program*

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Boys & Girls Club of Kennebec Valley
DATE: April 19, 2024
EVALUATOR NAME: Luba Greene
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

3. *Program Design*
4. *Program Management*
5. *Program Evaluation*

1. Planning: Met regularly involving partners
2. Need for program: Need indicated by NWEA scores showing high for Does Not Meet in all schools and 2 communities with 15% & 24% residents below poverty level
3. Program Design:
 - *Positives: Past data is positive / met goals; they were open through COVID & met goals; Open during vacations with week-long themes;
 - *Negative: in how to attract, could be more specific with what has worked in the past, would like to have read some examples
 - *Positives: School day staff; teacher longevity with program; State of Maine Childcare Licensing Regulations; multiple measures for safety;
 - *Positives: student choice of high-yield enrichment activities; Student Advisory Board: choice, voice, culture, multiple intelligences
 - *Innovative: students are aligned with a teacher mentor & group of peers
4. Program Management:
 - *Positives: longtime director, certified secondary education, commitment from staff to return if funded; school districts opening relevant workshops/PD to afterschool staff; lists several collaborations with local agencies to recruit volunteers; will offer a Counselor in Training Program

 - ?Question: Feasible?: “All enrolled students will leave the program each day with a daily progress report identifying their progress for parents & teachers to review.”
5. Program Evaluation:
 - *Positives: comprehensive plan for evaluation with a variety of research-based evaluation tools, academic and whole-child; programming will respond to the data collected; acknowledges success in meeting goals will bolster support of programming from families and community members

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Boys & Girls Club of Kennebec Valley
DATE: April 19, 2024
EVALUATOR NAME: Luba Greene
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

III. Budget Proposal

- 1. Budget Narrative*
- 2. Budget Forms*
- 3. Capacity for Success & Sustainability*

1. Budget Narrative:
*Positives: multiple sources for food; primarily no fees, but spelled out when fees are collected and offers scholarships for those who cannot pay

3. Sustainability Plan:
*Positives: the Boys & Girls Club of Kennebec has past successful grant funding; is part of The Boys & Girls Club of America, which provides additional funding sources; community business partnerships stepped up when funding was needed

Priority Points

- 1. Poverty Level*
- 2. ESEA Accountability Status*
- 3. Other Need*

1. Poverty Level:
Two schools meet the 40% Free & Reduced lunch requirement; one school (the middle school) does not, however, two communities that attend Gardiner Regional Middle School have residents at 15%-24% below the poverty line

3. Other Need: High numbers (60%-68%) of students in all 3 schools Do Not Meet standards on the NWEA

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Boys and Girls Club of Kennebec Valley (RSU 12)
DATE: 4/22/24
EVALUATOR NAME: RACHELLE TOME
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Instructions: *The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by **individual** evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is **required** that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department's RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.*

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Appendix A – Proposal Cover Page

- P: All elements are in place
- I: Expansion to new district?
- Q: Clubhouse at GRMS FRL% is 30% (< 40%)

Appendix B – Debarment, Performance, and Non-Collusion Certification

- P: Signed

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

- I. General Information*
- a. Abstract*
 - b. Program Demographics*
 - c. Partners*

- a. P: Nineteen years of previous programming with SAD 11
- c. P: Includes additional community partnerships

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

- II. Specifications of Work to be Performed*
- 1. Planning*
 - 2. Need for Program*
 - 3. Program Design*
 - 4. Program Management*

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Boys and Girls Club of Kennebec Valley (RSU 12)
DATE: 4/22/24
EVALUATOR NAME: RACHELLE TOME
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

5. Program Evaluation

- 2. N: Planning done: limited to admin only. Students? Parents?
- 2. P: Need outlined using NWEA results. Results from ongoing program indicates positive results.
- 2. N: Does not describe HOW the program will be carried out.
- 3. P: Wide range of activities, including hands-on.
- 3. P: 24 days in summer
- 3. Q: Expansion says 136 new students, not verified in other numbers.
- 3. Q: Is the middle school program at GRMS already in place?
- 3. I: Clubhouse provides more services school year and summer even though numbers served are the same for the 3 sites named.
- 3. P: Program to school coordination indicated
- 3. P: Experienced staff, familiar with the program and students
- 3. P: Topic appropriate PD, quarterly
- 3. P: Regular screening for Safe and appropriate environment
- 3. P: Boy's and Girl's Club outcomes surveys
- 3. P: Mentor and student choice in programming
- 3. P: Experienced (19 years) full time leadership; secondary ed certification, familiarity with SAD 11 curriculum.
- 3. Q: Two new site are elementary and in SAD 12; how will leadership coordinate curriculum and program differences?
- 3. P: Coordination and data sharing between CLC leadership and staff and those at Sad 11 and 12
- 3. P: Websites available for information dissemination.
- 3. P: Transportation available to all
- 3. P: Volunteers from multiple agencies.
- 4. Q: While the are ample data sources listed, the assessments are not in place and will need to be designed. Narrative does not speculate how often evaluation will take place.
- 4. Q. 4c narrative does not specify how and when data will be shared.

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

III. Budget Proposal

1. Budget Narrative

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Boys and Girls Club of Kennebec Valley (RSU 12)
DATE: 4/22/24
EVALUATOR NAME: RACHELLE TOME
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

- | |
|--|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none">2. <i>Budget Forms</i>3. <i>Capacity for Success & Sustainability</i> |
|--|

- 1. P: Narrative has ample detail
- 2. Q: Narrative is not clear about program fees (How does the amount for summer fees align with the \$155. Noted in the narrative.)
- 2. Q: There are two different hourly rates for site coordinators and school year tutors
- 2. I: Meals-supper provided
- 2. P: Transportation requirement met
- 3. Q: Appears to be no representation from RSU 12 on the Advisory Board
- 3. P: Student representation on the Advisory Board
- 3. P: Proven track record for sustainability
- 3. P: Multiple examples of coordination noted

<p><i>Priority Points</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. <i>Poverty Level</i>2. <i>ESEA Accountability Status</i>3. <i>Other Need</i>

- No specific mention of critical areas of need, except for high poverty and struggling students.

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Franklin County Children’s Task Force and RSU 73
DATE: 5/14/24
EVALUATOR NAME: Jessie Francis
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Instructions: *The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by **individual** evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is **required** that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department’s RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.*

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Appendix A – Proposal Cover Page

- Pass

Appendix B – Debarment, Performance, and Non-Collusion Certification

- Pass

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget
I. General Information
a. Abstract
b. Program Demographics
c. Partners

- II. Pass*
 - a. Abstract speaks to need for parenting resources*

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget
III. Specifications of Work to be Performed
1. Planning
2. Need for Program
3. Program Design
4. Program Management
5. Program Evaluation

- *Planning*

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Franklin County Children’s Task Force and RSU 73
DATE: 5/14/24
EVALUATOR NAME: Jessie Francis
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

- *P: Long planning period beginning in June of 2023, Superintendent support and other staff*
- *Need for Program*
 - *P: Need for program cites data including: school need (Tier 1), CPS cases increasing, increase in domestic assaults, poverty factors (SNAP, TANF), dropouts, juvenile arrests, babies born exposed to substance use.*
 - *N: Limited specific data points provided,*
 - *P: but references sources (Formal and informal data sources, quant and qual; MIYHS, community assessments)*
 - *P: Speaks to how the program will address several of these needs.*
- *Program Design*
 - *P: A range of types of activities presented (Academic, arts, physical activity). Emphasis on “social emotional competence”*
 - *P: Describes “rebound” from covid pandemic and success in implementing programming in the past*
 - *P: Meets state minimum operating requirements; exceeds in summer by 10 hours.*
 - *Q: Ratios are listed as a range, making it hard to judge what would actually be implemented; though this meets minimum.*
 - *P: Qualified staff and senior-level students from local university; describes PD provided for staff.*
 - *P: Safety section describes physical and psychological safety, background check procedures, food safety, etc.*
 - *P: student-groups in age increments to allow for developmentally appropriate programming*
 - *P: student choice of activities and “clubs” and rotation of activities every 6 weeks*
 - *P: describes a plan to communicate with families when attendance becomes a problem.*
 - **Goals**
 - *Q: Academic goals seem low; hard to say for sure because details on current academic performance not provided in needs section of the application.*
 - *P: specific activities described in goals section match up with other areas of the application*
- *Program Management*
 - *P: Quals and skills desired for program direct are described.*

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Franklin County Children’s Task Force and RSU 73
DATE: 5/14/24
EVALUATOR NAME: Jessie Francis
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

- *I: Restorative justice integrated into the program, support from district leadership for this approach*
- *Q: would have liked more specific info on how school leaders support this program outside of restorative practices.*
- *P: Transportation provided as well as other “outside funds” to support parents.*
- *P: System for oversight and recruitment of volunteers is described*
- *Program Evaluation*
 - **P:** Several data sources to be used in the evaluation are named (NEWA scores, IEPs, rubrics, surveys)
 - **P:** Data shared twice annually with stakeholders

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget
IV. Budget Proposal
1. Budget Narrative
2. Budget Forms
3. Capacity for Success & Sustainability

- Budget Narrative
 - **P:** Cost per RLP- \$2700
 - **P:** Fees not charged
 - **N:** Several private funding sources named in the abstract and not named on the budget forms. Unclear if these funds are secured or the types of funders the bidder may work with.
- Budget Forms:
 - **P:** Significant amount of in-kind provided by RSU 73, FCCTF, and UMaine Farmington
 - **P:** Detail supply line information provided on budget forms
 - **P:** District meets transportation match requirement
- *Capacity for Success & Sustainability*
 - ***P:** Large and varied advisory board, includes community representation and district leadership*
 - ***P:** very specific action steps described in sustainability plan including stakeholder engagement and raising funds through various means.*

Priority Points
1. Poverty Level

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Franklin County Children’s Task Force and RSU 73
DATE: 5/14/24
EVALUATOR NAME: Jessie Francis
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

- | |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">2. <i>ESEA Accountability Status</i>3. <i>Other Need</i> |
|---|

Data on dropouts, juvenile arrests, babies born exposed to substance use

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Franklin County Children’s Task Force - RSU 73
DATE: May 19, 2024
EVALUATOR NAME: Luba Greene
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Instructions: *The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by **individual** evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is **required** that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department’s RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.*

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Appendix A – Proposal Cover Page

- Renewal

Appendix B – Debarment, Performance, and Non-Collusion Certification

- No notes here

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

- I. General Information*
 - a. Abstract*
 - b. Program Demographics*
 - c. Partners*

- *Abstract - 3 schools; \$300,000 in first year; RSU73 providing 100% transportation; several points mentioned for family / parenting support to help foster academic achievement*
- *Program Demographics - Total to be served 185; RLP total 112; \$2678 / RLP; Primary School = 60% LP; Elementary School = 62% LP; Middle School = 60%; strong number of parents to be served (aligns)*
- *Partners - (positive) great variety (outdoors/nature; community agencies; health & wellness; farms; family support agencies)*

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Franklin County Children’s Task Force - RSU 73
DATE: May 19, 2024
EVALUATOR NAME: Luba Greene
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

II. Specifications of Work to be Performed

- 1. Planning*
- 2. Need for Program*
- 3. Program Design*
- 4. Program Management*
- 5. Program Evaluation*

- *Planning - long standing partnership with RSU73; Planning was varied to ensure intentionality and maximize all resources; great planning timeline about 83 hours - not sure who is representing RSU73 after 10/2023;*
- *Need for Program - 16.6% living in poverty, lack of reliable transportation noted 2022 Community Health Needs Assessment for Franklin County; Needs Assessment included varied sources both formal and informal; Provided many other data points for societal determinants of health. Elementary School is an ESEA Title 1, Tier 3 school with Child Protective Services noting “substantiated/indicated cases have increased and continue rising” - Office Disciplinary Referrals have risen; increase in reported domestic violence, poverty - many more listed; (positive) - whole-family engagement activities such as sledding parties, parades)*
- *Program Design - 3 school year sites, 1 summer program site; student-directed STEM and visual/performing arts; doubled attendance and tripling # of RLP students since the pandemic; Linkages - communication protocol in place; confidence in staff: teachers/tutors; Ed. Techs & UMaine Farmington Senior students; variety of communication methods w/parents; Instructional Leadership - teachers/tutors; Ed. Techs & UMaine Farmington Senior students; District practices for behavior management are followed; program staff participate in school day trainings; bus driver communication; both FCCTF and RSU73 leadership teams regularly observe and assess the programs
Safe/Appropriate - behavior management trainings; mandated reporters; safety measures in place
Student-Driven - rotation of activities; clubs of interest and age-specific; learning styles considered in planning curriculum
Regular Attendees - general ideas are listed (communication, food, transportation, other supports) *would like to have heard more specific examples*

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Franklin County Children’s Task Force - RSU 73
DATE: May 19, 2024
EVALUATOR NAME: Luba Greene
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

- *Program Management*
 - Program Leadership - director’s qualification listed; experience in education and social services; diverse families, SEL, management experience, communication*
 - School Leadership - discussed Restorative Practices being implemented to fit with school’s goals (Restorative Room, weekly academic reporting); school staff encouraged to teach in the program*
 - Staff & Professional Development - Coordination w/school day PD (2 hours/month); Site Coordinators and staff work together to determine non-program hour staff development topics*
 - Information Dissemination - several methods listed including technology, paper, Speaker’s Bureau; media/photos for annual presentation to school board; 4th grade reading level; participation in the Chamber of Commerce for community involvement; *would like to hear more specific examples of how to promote program*
 - Transportation - bus home; summer pick up and drop off locations organized; staff ride buses; gas cards for family events as needed;*
 - Volunteers - Franklin County Volunteer Network, RSU73, FCCTF & University combine to boast large volunteer bank; volunteer oversight, training, and use of their skill sets considered;*
- *Program Evaluation - programming is developed based on collected academic data and school day curriculum; tutors have Maine teaching credentials; performance measures listed; survey results are shared with school district leadership to assess feedback and identify action steps; periodic - fall/spring; SAYO & Teach Surveys; parent surveys, parent advisory group, DOE site reviews; and student input to drive activities; Data presentations twice per year (previous it said once per year?); Gave several specific ideas for sharing program successes to the community*

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

III. Budget Proposal

- 1. Budget Narrative*
- 2. Budget Forms*
- 3. Capacity for Success & Sustainability*

- *Budget Narrative - estimated cost per RLP \$2700; 100% of this funding dedicated to programming and not administration; No fees charged; Sponsorship for field trips secured; \$182,000 in financial and in-kind contributions; the FCCTF has history of braiding local, state and federal funding (gave examples)*

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Franklin County Children’s Task Force - RSU 73
DATE: May 19, 2024
EVALUATOR NAME: Luba Greene
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

- *Budget Forms - Parent Engagement Specialist (listed under private funding - I’d just like to hear more about the position because it sounds interesting);
Food - SNAP-Ed programming is free isn’t it? ; would like to see more resources for food such as CACFP through RSU73;
Transportation - budgeting for Field Trip transportation Summer*
- *Capacity for Success & Sustainability - Advisory Board members varied;
Sustainability Plan - advisory board continue w/a broad spectrum of members & rotating for new ideas; strong plan including Grant Writing; many ways to recruit enrichment & academic tutoring staff from UMF; (*Innovative: attain self-sustaining non-perishable program materials through donation ie. snowshoes, scooters, robotics); included a more detailed list of ways to promote program here (*Positive - interview parents for testimonials to promote the need for the program for economic stability)
Key Partners: this sounds solid and based on longevity of partnership and with UMF; collaboration with RSU73 for interviewing and hiring, insurance, background checks*

Priority Points

1. *Poverty Level*
2. *ESEA Accountability Status*
3. *Other Need*

- *Poverty Level - 16.6% poverty level of community;*
- *ESEA Accountability Status*
- *Other Need - transportation barriers; loss of largest employer and its societal impacts to families; increased domestic violence & CPS incidents; increased student behavioral referrals;*

Appendix D:

Student surveys given regularly; great examples for Family Engagement & Education here; (*Interesting! “Staff now trained to track distribution of parent ed vs. promo materials”) (*Positive list of strategies/activities under Sustainability / high visibility - presentation library of PowerPoints, photos, video; Board Member expectations/ways they can reach out for community support/resources; Fundraising ideas list for 1.5% is great) (Positive - clear outline of visibility for PD, sustainability)

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Franklin County Children’s Task Force (RSU 73)
DATE: 5/19/24
EVALUATOR NAME: RACHELLE TOME
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Instructions: *The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by **individual** evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is **required** that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department’s RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.*

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Appendix A – Proposal Cover Page

- P: Renewal-3> 40% FRL
- I: \$300,000

Appendix B – Debarment, Performance, and Non-Collusion Certification

- P: Signed

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

- I. *General Information*
 - a. *Abstract*
 - b. *Program Demographics*
 - c. *Partners*

- P: Includes parenting resources and strategies to address limited transportation
- I: Total served 185; RLP 112, Cost per \$2678.57
- Q: Total-972; LP-588; 3.1% served?
- P: Wide range of additional partners, including university, health, Head Start, PD

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

- II. *Specifications of Work to be Performed*
 - 1. *Planning*
 - 2. *Need for Program*
 - 3. *Program Design*
 - 4. *Program Management*

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Franklin County Children’s Task Force (RSU 73)
DATE: 5/19/24
EVALUATOR NAME: RACHELLE TOME
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

5. Program Evaluation

- 1a. P: Ongoing partnerships.
- 1a. P: Multiple measures for meeting, data collection, in-person inventories
- 1b. P: Meetings June 2023-April 2024 70+ hours
- 1b. P: Numerous planning sessions with a variety of groups
- 2: P: Comprehensive needs assessment with formal and informal sources: Google polls,
- 2. P: Spruce MTN ES- Tier 3; increase in substantiated child abuse cases, increase in discipline referrals,
- 2.P: Several needs are identified, including physical and emotional health, and academic issues related to poverty, isolation and domestic violence
- 2.P: MIYHS data-RSU 73 ranks in top quartile for drug/alcohol use, bullying etc.
- 3.1a. Program features stations addressing a variety of topics- academic, social/emotional, the arts, STEM, prevention, physical expression
- 3.1a. Staff training on key topics: protective factors, trauma informed, academics,
- 3.1 I: 3 afterschool sites; Highest #s K-2, lowest 6-8
- 3.1.I: required hours (minimum), student to staff ratios reasonable
- 3.2a. Coordinated communication protocol for planning. Use of experienced staff, ed techs and UMF education interns as tutors
- 3.2a. Program considers learning styles
- 3.2b. Use of experienced staff, ed techs and UMF education interns as tutors
- 3.2b. Staff orientation and additional PD. Training in required areas, including Restorative practice and Behavior Management
- 3.2c Steps taken to ensure safety in transportation, behavior management, food safety
- 3.2d. Variety of activities including SEL and STEM;6-week rotations. Students have choice of “clubs”. Consideration of learning styles.
- 3.2e. Transportation, healthy snacks to encourage attendance. Plan in place to address absences.
- 3.3 low expectations for % of overall academic improvement for math/ literacy.
- 3.3 Frequent opportunities to participate in selection of physical activity options.
- 3.3 Reasonable parent involvement opportunities.
- 3.4a. Qualifications for director appear minimal (BA/BS) for leadership, expecting an understanding of areas that are crucial to program success

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Franklin County Children’s Task Force (RSU 73)
DATE: 5/19/24
EVALUATOR NAME: RACHELLE TOME
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

- 3.4b. Use of restorative practices to build leadership support. Focus on collaboration in development of proposal.
- 3.4c. An explicit plan for PD is not present. Needs are determined by site coordinators but must be secured by program coordinators and provided during non-program hours. Staff expected to attend district PD (min. 2hrs monthly).
- 3.4d. Weekly check-ins, email and texts. Annual presentations. Program information at all school events. Parent/ student involvement in creating presentation. Connections to Chamber of Commerce
- 3.4e. Q: Summer transportation is from designated areas. How accessible is this for all students?
- 3.4e. Gas cards to assist parents’ attendance and family events
- 3.4f. Access to a volunteer bank which includes local university students.
- 3.5a. Narrative is not explicit about the evaluation process beyond the collection of assessment data, student data.
- 3.5b. Fall spring assessments, input via surveys. Presentation of data twice a yearly, sources include surveys, SAYO data Student input.
- 3.5. Q periodic evaluations based on student surveys. Data presentations twice a year. Presentations through various venues.

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

III. Budget Proposal

- 1. Budget Narrative*
- 2. Budget Forms*
- 3. Capacity for Success & Sustainability*

- 1a. Estimated per pupil \$2700. (Actual is \$2678.57)
- 1c. No fees
- 1d. Several sources for funding cited including John T.Gorman, Title I
- 1e. Purpose is very general.
- 1f. \$182K in in-kind from RSU 73, FCCF, UMF
- 2. (001) In-kind matches narrative
- 2. (001) in-kind staffing not included in personnel list (003)
- 2. (005) 35% transportation costs covered by district
- 3a. No students listed on the advisory board; one parent noted. Most members are district staff.
- 3b. A variety of strategies listed to support sustainability, including rotation of advisory board members, grants and coordination with local university.

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Franklin County Children’s Task Force (RSU 73)
DATE: 5/19/24
EVALUATOR NAME: RACHELLE TOME
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

- 3c. Consistent involvement of key partners

Priority Points

1. *Poverty Level*
2. *ESEA Accountability Status*
3. *Other Need*

- Job losses/ pandemic issues
- Higher than state average rates of child abuse, substance abuse, and untreated mental health

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Franklin County Children’s Task Force and RSU 58
DATE: 4/16/24
EVALUATOR NAME: Jessie Francis
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Instructions: *The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by **individual** evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is **required** that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department’s RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.*

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Appendix A – Proposal Cover Page

- Expansion Proposal

Appendix B – Debarment, Performance, and Non-Collusion Certification

- Pass

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget
I. General Information
a. Abstract
b. Program Demographics
c. Partners

- a) Abstract
- b) Program Demographics
 - 120 students, 100 RLPs, 85 per day
 - 2 Multi-lingual learners
 - 25 Special ed, 28%
 - Cost/RLP= \$2,582.52
 - **P:** Proposing serving one parent for every student
- c) Partners
 - **P:** Long list of partners (14 in addition to the Lead and district)
 - **N:** not all listed partners are described in the application as to how they’ll be involved in the program.

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Franklin County Children’s Task Force and RSU 58
DATE: 4/16/24
EVALUATOR NAME: Jessie Francis
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget
II. Specifications of Work to be Performed
1. Planning
2. Need for Program
3. Program Design
4. Program Management
5. Program Evaluation

1. *Planning*
 - **P:** Ties planning to needs for program
 - **P:** Long list of planning dates starting in June of 2023
 - **P:** Many individuals involved in planning including Board members
 - **Q:** Not sure who is involved on the grant writing team
2. *Need for Program*
 - **P:** Describes completing a comprehensive needs analysis
 - **P:** Identifies several needs for programming including, social determinants of health, poverty, lack of transportation, higher than average rates of violence, higher rates of single-parent families and unemployment, lower academic outcomes
 - **P:** student choice offered
 - **P:** Ties some needs to research
3. *Program Design*
 - i. *Various program offerings described*
 - ii. **P:** A variety of similar program offerings for parents (mindfulness and yoga classes)
 - iii. **P:** staff trained in trauma-informed approaches
 - iv. **Q:** 75 RLP students listed as average served per day in this section, 85 in abstract.
 - v. **P:** Superintendent and principals joined advisory group
 - vi. **Q:** Ratios are listed as a range, sometimes well-exceeding required ratios, sometimes meeting. Curious if this will be to individualize based on activity, but it’s not clear in this section.
 - **High quality programming:**
 - i. **P:** Established communication between afterschool and school day staff.
 - ii. **P:** staff include elementary school teachers, ed techs, and senior level UMF students.

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Franklin County Children’s Task Force and RSU 58
DATE: 4/16/24
EVALUATOR NAME: Jessie Francis
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

- iii. **P:** references a variety of teaching styles and tools to be utilized
- iv. **P:** all staff complete orientation and additional hours of PD
- v. **P:** staff engage in self-evaluation and evaluation by managers including observations
- vi. **P:** Application covers a variety of safety aspects
- vii. **P:** Detail provided in schedule of programming (rotate every 6 weeks) and examples of programming to be provided, plus “free club” for students to choose
- viii. **P:** application describes plan for addressing poor attendance, including offering supports for community resources around childcare

4. Program Management

- **I:** Does not indicate a program director is hired, though this is an expansion program.
- **P:** Will request staff feedback following PD delivery
- **P:** District will provide transportation
- **P:** Other supports for transportation (e.g., gas cards to family events) describe.
- **P:** plan to have program staff ride buses

5. Program Evaluation

- **P:** Describes how performance will be measured (including NEWA scores, rubrics, IEPs, standardized assessment scores, surveys)
- **P:** describes data presentations to share results with community.
- **N:** Doesn’t really describe how these data will be used to improve programming—just that it will be shared.

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

III. Budget Proposal

- 1. Budget Narrative
- 2. Budget Forms
- 3. Capacity for Success & Sustainability

1. Budget Narrative

- **Q:** describes other funders but most of the funding partners listed are not included in the budget; presumably these are the funders the program may reach out to for grants as described in the sustainability plan, but it is unclear.

2. Budget Forms

- **P:** In-kind is approximately 50% of budget

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Franklin County Children’s Task Force and RSU 58
DATE: 4/16/24
EVALUATOR NAME: Jessie Francis
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

- **N/Q:** *Occupancy expense, utilities, maintenance not listed in in-kind and no budget provided.*
 - **P:** *lowest paid staff is \$17/hour. Staff benefits accounted for*
 - **Q:** *1FTE Parent engagement specialist is listed in staff but not funded by CCLC; doesn’t tie to in-kind amounts in budget so I’m curious how this is funded?*
 - **N:** *Student transportation only listed in budget as field trip—what about the cost of daily student transportation?*
3. *Capacity for Success & Sustainability*
- **P:** *Board includes school staff, leadership, and community members*
 - **P:** *measurable action items described in sustainability plan (e.g., apply for multiple grants through the year)*
 - **P:** *Sustainability plan includes multiple prongs—seeking additional funding, marketing (“making 21st century kids of greater franklin” a household name, engaging local college for staff/practicum students).*

Priority Points

1. *Poverty Level*
2. *ESEA Accountability Status*
3. *Other Need*

Pending info from DOE

- *higher than average rates of violence, higher rates of single-parent families*

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Franklin County Children’s Task Force - RSU 58
DATE: April 19, 2024
EVALUATOR NAME: Luba Greene
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Instructions: *The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by **individual** evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is **required** that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department’s RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.*

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Appendix A – Proposal Cover Page

- Expansion

Appendix B – Debarment, Performance, and Non-Collusion Certification

- no notes

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

I. General Information

- a. Abstract*
- b. Program Demographics*
- c. Partners*

a. Abstract

*Positives: programming to respond to known county health issue of obesity; family transportation barriers noted

b. Program Demographics: 2 schools @ K-4 and 1 middle school gr.5-8

c. Partners:

*Positives: strong community partnerships

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

II. Specifications of Work to be Performed

1. Planning

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Franklin County Children’s Task Force - RSU 58
DATE: April 19, 2024
EVALUATOR NAME: Luba Greene
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

- 2. *Need for Program*
- 3. *Program Design*
- 4. *Program Management*
- 5. *Program Evaluation*

- 1. Planning:
*Positives: extensive planning timeline; gathered evidence from multiple sources including family functioning assessments
- 2. Need for Program:
*Positives: focus on promoting protective factors that help combat the effects of stress & trauma; addressing other health factors of rural living
- 3. Program Design:
*Positives: co-facilitated by students; establishing a common protocol for sharing information; confidence in staff; center and school leadership teams regularly observe & assess the programs & student outcomes; great detailed list for Safe Environments; University of Maine Farmington Seniors included in leadership; new program staff have 2-day orientation & 8 hours Professional Development; plan to address barriers to participation if poor attendance; strong parent involvement ideas/creative
*Innovative: Health & Wellness - Care & Share Food Club; Milestone Achievement Awards for attendance
- 4. Program Management:
*Positives: solid school collaboration for Professional Development; Chamber of Commerce participation for information sharing;
*Innovative: Speaker’s Bureau giving presentations; reducing barriers to transportation to special events (gas cards)
- 5. Program Evaluation:
*Positives: includes Survey of Academic Youth Outcomes; parent advisory group

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

III. Budget Proposal

- 1. *Budget Narrative*
- 2. *Budget Forms*
- 3. *Capacity for Success & Sustainability*

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Franklin County Children’s Task Force - RSU 58
DATE: April 19, 2024
EVALUATOR NAME: Luba Greene
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

1. Budget Narrative:
*Positives: Franklin County Children’s Task Force has positive history of “braiding local, state, & federal funding”; 100% to programming and not administrative; strong in-kind contributions
?Question: Parent Engagement Specialist is mentioned under Program Income but not discussed anywhere else
3. Sustainability:
*Positives: extensive advisory board; regularly scheduled grant writing; engaging partners to include them in their grant awards; University of Maine Farmington student recruited for volunteers & enrichment; funding goals stated
*Innovative: strong ideas for high visibility promotion - presentations; inviting press; archive in libraries
*Interesting: MSAD58 provides 2 hours monthly of Professional Development time for program tutors to collaborate
?Question: “Meet with parents to discuss ways to create an opt out vs. opt in environment.”

Priority Points

1. *Poverty Level*
2. *ESEA Accountability Status*
3. *Other Need*

1. Poverty Level: Free & Reduced Lunch rates: 35%, 60%, 50%
3. Other Need: Bidder noted rural social determinants of health

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Franklin County Children’s Task Force (RSU 58)
DATE: 4/23/24
EVALUATOR NAME: RACHELLE TOME
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Instructions: *The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by **individual** evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is **required** that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department’s RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.*

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Appendix A – Proposal Cover Page

- P: Expansion-1 < 40% FRL; 2 > 40%

Appendix B – Debarment, Performance, and Non-Collusion Certification

- P: Signed

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget
I. General Information
a. Abstract
b. Program Demographics
c. Partners

- P: Includes parenting resources and strategies to address obesity
- P: Wide range of additional partners, including university and health

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget
II. Specifications of Work to be Performed
1. Planning
2. Need for Program
3. Program Design
4. Program Management
5. Program Evaluation

- 1. P: Initial needs assessment then more comprehensive with focus groups

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Franklin County Children’s Task Force (RSU 58)
DATE: 4/23/24
EVALUATOR NAME: RACHELLE TOME
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

- 1. P: Focus on a whole family approach
- 1. P: Numerous planning sessions with a variety of groups
- 2: P: Comprehensive needs assessment conducted with several agencies, including the County Health Network
- 2. P: Several needs are identified, including physical and emotional health, and academic issues related to poverty, isolation and domestic violence
- 3. I: 3 afterschool sites; 1 summer site (for all schools)
- 3. P: Variety of activities including SEL and STEM; monthly family engagement
- 3. Q: Reliance on community event and open house to maintain and grow enrollment
- 3. P: Coordinated communication protocol for planning. Use of experienced ed techs and UMF education interns as tutors
- 3. P: Parent engagement through various means.
- 3. P Instructors/ tutors-experienced staff and UMF students with knowledge of standards and instruction.
- 3. P: Training in required areas, including Restorative practice and Behavior Management
- 3. P: Opportunities for students choice in activity selection: consideration of 7 learning styles in curriculum development
- 3. P: Transportation provided by SAD 58. Additional actions noted if attendance becomes an issue.
- 4. Q: Qualifications for director appear minimal (BA/BS) for leadership, expecting an understanding of areas that are crucial to program success
- 4. Q: Other than collaborative planning, involvement of school/ district leaders is not apparent. Use of space is a minimal level of engagement.
- 4. Q: An explicit plan for PD is not present. Needs are determined by site coordinators but acquired by program coordinators.
- 4. P: Weekly check-ins, email and texts. Annual presentations.
- 4. Q: Communications appear mostly one way.
- 4: Q: Summer transportation is from designated areas. How accessible is this for all students?
- 4. P: Gas cards to assist parents’ attendance and family events
- 4. P: Access to a volunteer bank which includes local university students
- 5. Q: Narrative is not explicit about the evaluation process beyond the collection of assessment data.

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Franklin County Children’s Task Force (RSU 58)
DATE: 4/23/24
EVALUATOR NAME: RACHELLE TOME
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

- 5. P: Fall spring assessments, input via surveys. Presentation of data twice a yearly, sources are not clearly articulated.
- 5. Q periodic evaluations based on student surveys

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

III. Budget Proposal

- 1. Budget Narrative*
- 2. Budget Forms*
- 3. Capacity for Success & Sustainability*

- 1. N: Narrative references a history of using federal, state funding sources, but information of not specific.
- 1. P: Grant funds used exclusively for programming.
- 1. P: High percentage of in kind and financial contributions
- 2: Q: \$31,000 of in-kind salaries and wages (001) not included in personnel list (003)
- 2. P: All transportation costs covered by district
- 3. N: No parents or students listed on the advisory board
- 3. P: A variety of strategies listed to support sustainability, including grants and coordination with local university
- 3. P: Consistent involvement of key partners

Priority Points

- 1. Poverty Level*
- 2. ESEA Accountability Status*
- 3. Other Need*

- Higher than state average rates of child abuse, substance abuse, and untreated mental health
- Obesity is a top concern.

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: LearningWorks and Biddeford Public Schools
DATE: 5/14/24
EVALUATOR NAME: Jessie Francis
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Instructions: *The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by **individual** evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is **required** that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department's RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.*

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Appendix A – Proposal Cover Page

- Pass

Appendix B – Debarment, Performance, and Non-Collusion Certification

- Pass

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

- I. *General Information*
 - a. *Abstract*
 - b. *Program Demographics*
 - c. *Partners*

II. *Pass*

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

- III. *Specifications of Work to be Performed*
 1. *Planning*
 2. *Need for Program*
 3. *Program Design*
 4. *Program Management*
 5. *Program Evaluation*

- *Planning*
 - **P:** *Long planning period (beginning December 2023)*

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: LearningWorks and Biddeford Public Schools
DATE: 5/14/24
EVALUATOR NAME: Jessie Francis
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

- **Q:** *Not a significant amount of time dedicated to planning work.*
- **Need for Program**
 - **P:** *Describes need for programming (lack of afterschool opportunities, poverty, large number of students served by CDS, academic data, increased challenging behaviors, housing instability)*
 - **N:** *Needs section does not describe how program will meet these needs*
- **Program Design**
 - **P:** *specific info on curriculum—project-based, STEAM curriculum*
 - **P:** *Students pick clubs*
 - **P:** *Meeting minimum hour requirements*
 - **P:** *Staff to student ratios are higher for academics but much lower for enrichment and recreation*
 - **P:** *Specific examples of linking programming time with in-school time (e.g., PBIS, shared PD, planning meetings and school leadership on advisory boards, provision of data)*
 - **P:** *Current program director has teaching and 21st CCLC experience*
 - **P:** *mentions physical and emotional safety*
 - **Goals**
 - **P:** *rigorous academic targets*
 - **P:** *Goals align with other aspects of the application*
- **Program Management**
 - **P:** *Background of program director described*
 - **I:** *Describes collaboration with other LWAS program directors*
 - **P:** *PD informed by the Youth Program Quality Assessment and other specific topics mentioned (responsive classroom techniques, STEAM, cultural competency)*
 - **P:** *Transportation provided at 35%*
 - **P:** *Process for recruiting and vetting volunteers is described*
- **Program Evaluation**
 - **P:** *Evaluation aligned with the YPQA domains; assessed annually and linked with annual goals*
 - **P:** *Measures of student success identified (NWEA, report cards, surveys)*
 - **I:** *one measure is increased student confidence*
 - **P:** *Annual presentation of evaluation to advisory board*
 - **P:** *ongoing integration of evaluation suggestions*

<p><i>Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget</i></p> <p><i>IV. Budget Proposal</i></p>
--

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: LearningWorks and Biddeford Public Schools
DATE: 5/14/24
EVALUATOR NAME: Jessie Francis
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

1. *Budget Narrative*
2. *Budget Forms*
3. *Capacity for Success & Sustainability*

- Budget Narrative
 - **P:** cost per RLP = \$2697 at 75 RLPs
 - **Q:** “If fees become necessary” yet no plan to collect fees is described.
- Budget Forms:
 - **P:** Significant in-kind provided by BSD, Learning works, and other partners
 - **Q:** Though a small budget item, contracted services are unclear based on form explanations (E.g., “classroom visits” and “Estimate” are listed for contracted services)
 - **Q:** Other federal funding source includes “21st CCLC Grant-Second Biddeford grant” yet it is unclear what this is specifically and how the program will use two 21st CCLC to provide the services and what will be provided with this funding.
 - **P:** 35% of transportation provided by the school district
 - **Q:** Other line seems high for the explanation provided: background check costs and technology support.
- *Capacity for Success & Sustainability*
 - **P:** Various community partners participating in advisory board, including a parent
 - **N:** the sustainability plan is very broad and focused on Learningworks as an organization rather than the sustainability of the specific program.

Priority Points

1. *Poverty Level*
2. *ESEA Accountability Status*
3. *Other Need*

Housing instability

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: LearningWorks - Biddeford
DATE: May 19, 2024
EVALUATOR NAME: Luba Greene
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Instructions: The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by **individual** evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is **required** that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department's RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Appendix A – Proposal Cover Page

- Renewal

Appendix B – Debarment, Performance, and Non-Collusion Certification

- no notes here

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

- I. General Information
 - a. Abstract
 - b. Program Demographics
 - c. Partners

- Abstract -
- Program Demographics - 2 schools: Biddeford Primary Gr1-2 & Kennedy School GrPK-K; schools are at 51% & 50% F&R Lunch, respectively; and % of students that are LP are 70% and 40%, respectively.
- Partners - lists 10 partners including school district, college, community agencies, & other organizations

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

- II. Specifications of Work to be Performed
 1. Planning
 2. Need for Program
 3. Program Design

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: LearningWorks - Biddeford
DATE: May 19, 2024
EVALUATOR NAME: Luba Greene
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

- | |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">4. Program Management5. Program Evaluation |
|---|

- Planning - timeline included 11 meetings, mostly LearningWorks Internal Team; would have liked to have seen more community involvement
- Need for Program - 12.6% of community at poverty level; over 1/3 of children receive SNAP benefits; 10% receive TANF; 16% of PK-5 are ELL; 36% of incoming students didn't meet motor skills benchmarks; 36% did not meet conceptual benchmarks and 37% did meet language benchmarks; at BPS 50% of 1st graders designated for Intervention in Literacy; with 47% in Math; community noted substance use disorder, poverty, domestic violence, incarceration, and housing instability adding stress and trauma on youth
- Program Design - (*Positive - strong numbers for past parent engagement)
LWAS has built consistent referral pathways with school leadership and teaching staff; low ratios = good for younger students
Linkages - referrals from BSD staff and continuous support; program staff participate in district-sponsored PD and curriculum planning meetings, and is reciprocal;
Instructional Leadership - Program Director has teaching and 21stCCLC Leadership experience; principals consult on all hired; programming includes guests, field trips, and community partnerships; data-driven enrichment programming;
Safe & Appropriate - staff is First Aid & CPR trained; social-emotional strategies; Responsive Classroom approach is used; respect for cultural and socio-economic diversity
Student-Driven - high-interest student driven-chosen activities; relationship-based approach cultivates a sense of belonging;
Attendees - predictable scheduling & high-interest student chosen/driven; proactive, positive family outreach for absences; located at school; no cost; food provided
- Program Management - LWAS executive director; two site coordinators; monthly meetings with school staff/leadership; financial support & promotion from school district; PD is guided by school-wide priorities, surveys, YPQA, program observations, alignment with YAA core knowledge and competencies; staff feedback, regular meetings; variety of communication methods; monthly newsletter & language translation offered; students transported home and to and

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: LearningWorks - Biddeford
DATE: May 19, 2024
EVALUATOR NAME: Luba Greene
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

from summer program, BSD providing 35%; volunteers recruited from variety of methods including parents, high school, community

- Program Evaluation
Includes a variety of sources including assessment data, teacher surveys, parent surveys, YPQA measures; DOE site visits, advisory board and school admin. input; each site creates a PQI plan that integrates assessment and survey data and conducts regular reviews of its progress

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

III. Budget Proposal

1. Budget Narrative
2. Budget Forms
3. Capacity for Success & Sustainability

- Budget Narrative - LW contributing \$1,338 from fundraising and private donations (feels low); No fees are charged at this time, but may be in the future - not clearly defined; BSD providing food for snacks and meals in the Summer
- Budget Forms - Unclear about 2/3 of Director's cell phone cost; Unclear why there are background check costs
- Capacity for Success & Sustainability
Advisory Board has varied representation; long time partnerships with Maine schools and Maine DOE; has fiscal controls in place to manage funds and any future funding; generally a MOA of partners & history of LW

Priority Points

1. Poverty Level
2. ESEA Accountability Status
3. Other Need

- Poverty Level - Biddeford Primary Gr1-2 & Kennedy School GrPK-K; schools are at 51% & 50% F&R Lunch, respectively; and % of students that are LP are 70% and 40%, respectively
- ESEA Accountability Status
- Other Need - 12.6% of community at poverty level; over 1/3 of children receive SNAP benefits; 10% receive TANF; 16% of PK-5 are ELL; 36% of incoming students didn't meet motor skills benchmarks; 36% did not meet conceptual benchmarks and 37% did meet language benchmarks; at BPS 50% of 1st graders designated for Intervention in Literacy; with 47% in Math; community

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: LearningWorks - Biddeford
DATE: May 19, 2024
EVALUATOR NAME: Luba Greene
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

noted substance use disorder, poverty, domestic violence, incarceration, and housing instability adding stress and trauma on youth

Appendix D:

Boston Museum of Science STEAM curriculum; Would like to see more detailed examples of activities for academic programming as well as for STEM and Family Engagement ideas; cultural activities could be more since the population has much diversity;

Appreciate the list of Safety Education ideas and strategies for Sustainability & Collaboration;

Appreciate considerations for ELL caregivers with accessibility for communications

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: LearningWorks (Biddeford)
DATE: 5/23/24
EVALUATOR NAME: RACHELLE TOME
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Instructions: *The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by **individual** evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is **required** that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department's RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.*

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Appendix A – Proposal Cover Page

- I: Renewal-2 > 50% FRL
- I: \$202,333.52
- I: PK-Grade 2

Appendix B – Debarment, Performance, and Non-Collusion Certification

- P: Signed

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

- I. General Information*
- a. Abstract*
 - b. Program Demographics*
 - c. Partners*

- Q: Indicates collaboration with Biddeford SD and community partners. Actual roles not detailed.
- P: Student centered after school and summer
- P: Special education and multi-lingual students served
- P: Diverse partners, including UNE, York County Southern Maine Health, Community Gardens.

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

- II. Specifications of Work to be Performed*
- 1. Planning*
 - 2. Need for Program*

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: LearningWorks (Biddeford)
DATE: 5/23/24
EVALUATOR NAME: RACHELLE TOME
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

*3. Program Design
4. Program Management
5. Program Evaluation*

- 1a. Successful programming for 12 years.
- 1a. Analysis of assessment data. Focus on SEL and literacy
- 1b. Planning included mostly LW team. No affiliation for those named.
- 1b. Meetings Dec 2023-Mar 2024 9 hours
- 2. N: Majority of rationale is similar to other LW proposals.
- 2. High levels of poverty, ELs, data related to school readiness and early learning. Recent study from Biddeford Ready indicates increases in behavior issues, substance abuse disorder, poverty, DV, incarceration.
- 3.1a. Project based STEAM curriculum modeled after Museum of Science. Student selected enrichment.
- 3.1a. N: Specific types of activities not clearly articulated
- 3.1a. N: Support for ELs not mentioned
- 3.1b. 2 sites; prior program has been well received. Positive experience with LWAS programs.
- 3.1c. Daily hours meet minimum requirements, SY and summer
- 3.1c. Staffing ratios acceptable
- 3.2a. Ongoing coordination and alignment with BSD policies. Staffing goals prioritizes hiring BSD staff. Participation in district PD.
- 3.2b. Staff experienced with youth development, language arts and STEAM
- 3.2b. N: Specific expectations for staff are clearly outlined
- 3.2b. N: Attention to multi-lingual needs of program participants is not noted even though high % identified as ELs in needs statement
- 3.2c. Best practices implemented for emergencies, dismissal, first aid. Training and resource binder provided.
- 3.2c. Responsive Classroom; inclusive, respectful environment, respect for socio-economic and cultural diversity.
- 3.2d. Planning process encourages student voice and choice through surveys, parental input
- 3.2d. Flexible grouping and multi-modal projects differentiated with attention to English language proficiency among considerations.
- 3.2d. Q: Appropriateness for early learners.
- 3.2e. Plan includes adequate measures for supporting regular attendance, including free transportation and following up with absences.

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: LearningWorks (Biddeford)
DATE: 5/23/24
EVALUATOR NAME: RACHELLE TOME
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

- 3.3. Expectations for % of overall academic improvement for math/ literacy appear ambitious.
- 3.3 Daily opportunities to participate in selection of physical activity options.
- 3.3 Materials, curricula from the Boston Museum of Science for STEAM.
- 3.3 ELL strategies incorporated.
- 3.3 Parental involvement opportunities. Includes translation services.
- 3.4a. Leadership staff are seasoned administrators. Site directors have experience in child development.
- 3.4b. Monthly meetings with BSD for collaboration.
- 3.4c. Variety of topics listed for PD including Responsive Classroom and socio-emotional practices
- 3.4c. Specific support for English learners not listed.
- 3.4c. PD effectiveness determined through staff meeting and follow-up meetings
- 3.4d. Communications disseminated by various means. Language interpretation is available.
- 3.4e. Transportation expectations are met. PPS covers 35% of the cost SY and 100% cost in summer.
- 3.4f. Volunteer screening and orientation provided. Recruited from families, local universities and organizations.
- 3.5a. Multiple data sources noted, including use of standardized test scores and report card information, but narrative does clearly articulate how this will be used to evaluate programming.
- 3.5b. Annual program evaluation outlined include quantitative (test scores, attendance rates) and qualitative (YQPA review, surveys) review.
- 3.5c. Quality improvement plans (PQI) developed based on evaluation results.
- 3.5c. N: Evaluation reports are shared with the advisory board. No indication of how results are shared with the public and used to build community support.

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

III. Budget Proposal

- 1. Budget Narrative*
- 2. Budget Forms*
- 3. Capacity for Success & Sustainability*

- 1. Budget narrative addresses required components. 75 RLP; \$2697.78.
- 1. No indication of use Federal or State funds, BSD in kind only. No references to sustainability of in-kind resources

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: LearningWorks (Biddeford)
DATE: 5/23/24
EVALUATOR NAME: RACHELLE TOME
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

- 1. No fees. Anything collected will be used for programming.
- 2: Q: \$23711.32 of additional 21st CCLC funds (002) not mentioned in budget narrative.
- 2. (005) 35% transportation costs covered by BSD
- 3a. Parents listed on the advisory board
- 3b. 15 years of programming. Strategies listed to support sustainability, including building relationships and coordination with several community partners.
- 3c. Consistent involvement of key partners; commitments delineated.

Priority Points

1. *Poverty Level*
2. *ESEA Accountability Status*
3. *Other Need*

- Higher % of Economic disadvantage
- Low % of early readiness
- % of students with special education or language needs
- Increases in substance abuse disorder, poverty, domestic violence, incarcerations.

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Learningworks and Portland (EE/R)
DATE: 5/15/24
EVALUATOR NAME: Jessie Francis
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Instructions: *The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by **individual** evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is **required** that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department's RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.*

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Appendix A – Proposal Cover Page

- Pass

Appendix B – Debarment, Performance, and Non-Collusion Certification

- Pass

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

- I. *General Information*
 - a. *Abstract*
 - b. *Program Demographics*
 - c. *Partners*

II. *Pass*

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

- III. *Specifications of Work to be Performed*
 1. *Planning*
 2. *Need for Program*
 3. *Program Design*
 4. *Program Management*
 5. *Program Evaluation*

- *Planning*
 - *P: Planning period from December 2023 through submission*

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Learningworks and Portland (EE/R)
DATE: 5/15/24
EVALUATOR NAME: Jessie Francis
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

- ***N:** Not always clear who is part of the planning meetings, lists only “Internal LearningWorks Staff”*
- *Need for Program*
 - ***P:** Describes need for programming through data (limited out of school opportunities, families living in poverty, high BIPOC population, high ELL population, high number of foreign-born adults without hs degree, some mention of academic performance but no specific data shared)*
 - ***N:** This section does not speak to how the program will address these needs.*
- *Program Design*
 - ***P:** STEAM curriculum*
 - ***Q:** only specific activities listed are STEAM, engineering, and technology activities are listed; does mention student-chosen clubs*
 - ***P:** meets required operational hours*
 - ***N:** Does not meet required student to staff ratio for homework help/tutoring.*
 - ***P:** recruit from local district*
 - ***P:** some more specific on the range of activities provided under “strong instructional leadership”*
 - ***P:** physical and emotional safety described—responsive classroom*
 - ***N:** with significant number of MLL served it would have been helpful to hear more how the program is designed to meet the needs of these students*
 - ***Goals***
 - ***P:** academic targets seem rigorous*
 - ***N:** though a bit hard to judge because specific academic data not provided in the application and these match with other applications by the same bidder so difficult to tell if these are individualized for the school/program.*
 - ***P:** More specific activities mentioned throughout the goals section as well as the MLL children and families*
- *Program Management*
 - ***Q:** Many of the same responses as other application, difficult to ascertain how tailored to this community the application is.*
 - ***P:** PD informed by the Youth Program Quality Assessment and other specific topics mentioned (responsive classroom techniques, STEAM, cultural competency)*
 - ***P:** Transportation provided at 35%*

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Learningworks and Portland (EE/R)
DATE: 5/15/24
EVALUATOR NAME: Jessie Francis
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

- *P: Process for recruiting and vetting volunteers is described*
- *Program Evaluation*
 - **P:** Evaluation aligned with the YPQA domains; assessed annually and linked with annual goals
 - **P:** Measures of student success identified (NWEA, report cards, surveys)
 - **I:** one measure is increased student confidence
 - **P:** Annual presentation of evaluation to advisory board
 - **P:** ongoing integration of evaluation suggestions

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

IV. Budget Proposal

- 1. Budget Narrative*
- 2. Budget Forms*
- 3. Capacity for Success & Sustainability*

- Budget Narrative
 - **P:** Includes cost per RLP \$2,700 per 60.
 - **P:** Describes additional funding sources
 - **Q:** “If fees become necessary” yet no plan to collect fees is described.
- Budget Forms:
 - **P:** Significant in-kind
 - **P:** 35% transportation match provided by district
- *Capacity for Success & Sustainability*
 - **P:** Various individuals on the advisory board including school leaders, community members, and parents.
 - **N:** the sustainability plan is very broad and focused on Learningworks as an organization rather than the sustainability of the specific program.

Priority Points

- 1. Poverty Level*
- 2. ESEA Accountability Status*
- 3. Other Need*

- *limited out of school opportunities, families living in poverty, high BIPOC population, high ELL population, high number of foreign-born adults without hs degree*

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: LearningWorks - Portland - East End & Reiche
DATE: May 19, 2024
EVALUATOR NAME: Luba Greene
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Instructions: The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by **individual** evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is **required** that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department's RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Appendix A – Proposal Cover Page

- Renewal

Appendix B – Debarment, Performance, and Non-Collusion Certification

- no notes here

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

- I. General Information
 - a. Abstract
 - b. Program Demographics
 - c. Partners

- Abstract
- Program Demographics - 2 schools: Reiche Gr.2-5 and East End Gr.2-5; Both schools are at 64% F&R Lunch status; with 53% LP and 57% LP students, respectively
- Partners - listed 18 partners, variety of organizations and agencies

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

- II. Specifications of Work to be Performed
 1. Planning
 2. Need for Program
 3. Program Design
 4. Program Management

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: LearningWorks - Portland - East End & Reiche
DATE: May 19, 2024
EVALUATOR NAME: Luba Greene
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

5. Program Evaluation

- Planning - held 18 planning meetings; primarily Internal LW staff (would have like to see more variety in participants)
- Need for Program - data includes poverty rate comparison to Portland (11.8%) with Reiche and East End at 61.7% and 71.3%, respectively; Portland has the highest number of BIPOC, immigrant, and refugee populations, which includes ELL students; MEA testing data indicates “significant percentage failing to meet proficiency standards”; both are Title I schools
- Program Design - positive past data until the pandemic, but have shown a steady gains in enrollment during their rebuilding stage; focus on staff recruitment strategies; student referrals made by PPS staff including teachers, interventionists, nurses, counselors; school leadership sits on Advisory Board; staff has youth development experience and subject expertise is preferred; staff trained in first aid, cpr, Responsive Classroom, social-emotional strategies; staff and volunteers are vetted with background and reference checks; student-driven programming through student surveys, voting, focus groups to foster student leadership and voice; Boston Museum of Science STEAM curriculum; multi-modal projects; predictable scheduling, high-interest student chosen/driven activities; school-based location; free transportation and snacks / meals
- Program Management
LWAS executive director; two site coordinators; monthly meetings with school staff/leadership; financial support & promotion from school district; PD is guided by school-wide priorities, surveys, YPQA, program observations, alignment with YAA core knowledge and competencies; staff feedback, regular meetings; variety of communication methods; monthly newsletter & language translation offered; students transported home and to and from summer program, BSD providing 35%; volunteers recruited from variety of methods including parents, high school, community
- Program Evaluation
Includes a variety of sources including assessment data, teacher surveys, parent surveys, YPQA measures; DOE site visits, advisory board and school admin. input; each site creates a PQI plan that integrates assessment and survey data and conducts regular reviews of its progress

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

- III. Budget Proposal
 - 1. Budget Narrative

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: LearningWorks - Portland - East End & Reiche
DATE: May 19, 2024
EVALUATOR NAME: Luba Greene
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

- | |
|--|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none">2. Budget Forms3. Capacity for Success & Sustainability |
|--|

- Budget Narrative - cost of \$2,700 per RPL student; LW contributing \$6,297 from fundraising and private donations; No fees currently but may be in future (unclear); PPS providing 35% of transportation costs
- Budget Forms - great list of in-kind contributions; (*Innovative - Foster Grandparent at each site); (*Question - a Director, Associate Director, and two site coordinators?); low cost line for consumables/supplies
- Capacity for Success & Sustainability - excellent varied list of Advisory Board members/representation; long time partnerships with Maine schools and Maine DOE; has fiscal controls in place to manage funds and any future funding; generally a MOA of partners & history of LW

<p>Priority Points</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Poverty Level2. ESEA Accountability Status3. Other Need

- Poverty Level Reiche Gr.2-5 and East End Gr.2-5; Both schools are at 64% F&R Lunch status; with 53% LP and 57% LP students, respectively
- ESEA Accountability Status
- Other Need -

Appendix D:

Would like to see more detailed examples of activities for academic programming as well as for STEM and Family Engagement ideas; cultural activities could be more since the population has much diversity;

Appreciate the list of Safety Education, Visual & Performing Arts ideas and strategies for Sustainability & Collaboration;

Appreciate considerations for ELL caregivers with accessibility for communications

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: LearningWorks (Portland) (EE&R)
DATE: 5/23/24
EVALUATOR NAME: RACHELLE TOME
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Instructions: *The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by **individual** evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is **required** that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department's RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.*

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Appendix A – Proposal Cover Page

- I: Renewal-2=64% FRL
- I: \$162,000

Appendix B – Debarment, Performance, and Non-Collusion Certification

- P: Signed

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

- I. General Information*
- a. Abstract*
 - b. Program Demographics*
 - c. Partners*

- Q: Indicates collaboration with PPS and community partners. Actual roles not detailed.
- P: Student centered after school and summer
- P: Special education and multi-lingual students served
- P: Diverse partners, including Ukeleles Heal the World, Maine College for the Arts, USM, UNE

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

- II. Specifications of Work to be Performed*
- 1. Planning*
 - 2. Need for Program*
 - 3. Program Design*

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: LearningWorks (Portland) (EE&R)
DATE: 5/23/24
EVALUATOR NAME: RACHELLE TOME
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

<i>4. Program Management</i> <i>5. Program Evaluation</i>
--

- 1a. Successful programming for 15 years.
- 1a. Focus on SEL and literacy
- 1b. Parents included as members of the Advisory Board. Not specifically mentioned here.
- 1b. Meetings Dec 2023-April 2024 21 hours
- 2. N: Majority of data referenced is for Portland as a whole.
- 2. High levels of poverty, ELs, immigrant populations.
- 2. N: Narrative is general to Portland and does not articulate how the programs will be implemented at the schools cited.
- 3.1a. Project based STEAM curriculum modeled after Museum of Science. Student selected enrichment.
- 3.1a. N: Specific types of activities not clearly articulated
- 3.1a. N: Support for ELs not mentioned
- 3.1b. 2 sites; prior program experiences impacts due to the pandemic, staffing challenges.
- 3.1c. Daily hours above minimum requirements, SY and summer
- 3.1c. Staffing ratios acceptable
- 3.2a. Ongoing coordination and alignment with PPS policies. Staffing goals prioritizes hiring PPS staff. Participation in district PD.
- 3.2b. Staff experienced with youth development, language arts and STEAM
- 3.2b. N: Specific expectations for staff are clearly outlined
- 3.2b. N: Attention to multi-lingual needs of program participants is not noted even though high % identified as ELs in needs statement
- 3.2c. Best practices implemented for emergencies, dismissal, first aid. Training and resource binder provided.
- 3.2c. Responsive Classroom; inclusive, respectful environment, respect for socio-economic and cultural diversity.
- 3.2d. Planning process encourages student voice and choice through surveys, parental input
- 3.2d. Flexible grouping and multi-modal projects differentiated with attention to English language proficiency among considerations.
- 3.2e. Plan includes adequate measures for supporting regular attendance, including free transportation and following up with absences.

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: LearningWorks (Portland) (EE&R)
DATE: 5/23/24
EVALUATOR NAME: RACHELLE TOME
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

- 3.3. Expectations for % of overall academic improvement for math/ literacy appear ambitious.
- 3.3 Daily opportunities to participate in selection of physical activity options.
- 3.3 Materials, curricula from the Boston Museum of Science for STEAM.
- 3.3 ELL strategies incorporated.
- 3.3 Parental involvement opportunities. Includes translation services.
- 3.4a. Leadership staff are seasoned administrators
- 3.4a. Plan outlines regular collaboration with PPS. Support from admin and instructional staff.
- 3.4c. Variety of topics listed for PD including Responsive Classroom and socio-emotional practices
- 3.4c. Specific support for English learners not listed.
- 3.4c. PD effectiveness determined through staff meeting and follow-up meetings
- 3.4d. Communications disseminated by various means. Language interpretation is available.
- 3.4e. Transportation expectations are met. PPS covers 35% of the cost SY and 100% cost in summer.
- 3.4f. Volunteer screening and orientation provided. Recruited from families, local universities and organizations.
- 3.5a. Multiple data sources noted, including use of standardized test scores and report card information, but narrative does clearly articulate how this will be used to evaluate programming.
- 3.5b. Annual program evaluation outlined include quantitative (test scores, attendance rates) and qualitative (YQPA review, surveys) review.
- 3.5c. Quality improvement plans (PQI) developed based on evaluation results.
- 3.5c. N: Evaluation reports are shared with the advisory board. No indication of how results are shared with the public and used to build community support.

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

III. Budget Proposal

- 1. Budget Narrative*
- 2. Budget Forms*
- 3. Capacity for Success & Sustainability*

- 1. Budget narrative addresses required components. 60 RLP; \$2700.
- 1. No indication of use Federal or State funds, PPS in kind only. No references to sustainability of in-kind resources

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: LearningWorks (Portland) (EE&R)
DATE: 5/23/24
EVALUATOR NAME: RACHELLE TOME
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

- 1. No fees. Anything collected will be used for programming.
- 2: Q: \$99864 of additional 21st CCLC funds (002) not mentioned in budget narrative.
- 2. (005) 35% transportation costs covered by PPS
- 3a. Parent (OAES) listed on the advisory board
- 3b. 15 years of programming. Strategies listed to support sustainability, including building relationships and coordination with several community partners.
- 3c. Consistent involvement of key partners; commitments delineated.

Priority Points

1. *Poverty Level*
2. *ESEA Accountability Status*
3. *Other Need*

- Higher % of BIPOC
- % of students with special education or language needs

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: LearningWorks and Portland (OA/P)
DATE: 4/18/24
EVALUATOR NAME: Jessie Francis
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Instructions: *The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by **individual** evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is **required** that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department's RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.*

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Appendix A – Proposal Cover Page

- Renewal

Appendix B – Debarment, Performance, and Non-Collusion Certification

- Pass

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

- I. General Information*
- a. Abstract*
 - b. Program Demographics*
 - c. Partners*

- a) Abstract
- b) Program Demographics
 - 80 students per day; 60 RLPs average per day
 - **P:** high percentage of multi-lingual students (26)
- c) Partners
 - **P:** Multiple and varied partners listed
 - **N:** No indication that district leadership has participated in or is committed to planning

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget
II. Specifications of Work to be Performed

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: LearningWorks and Portland (OA/P)
DATE: 4/18/24
EVALUATOR NAME: Jessie Francis
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

- | |
|--|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. <i>Planning</i>2. <i>Need for Program</i>3. <i>Program Design</i>4. <i>Program Management</i>5. <i>Program Evaluation</i> |
|--|

1. *Planning*
 - a. **N/Q:** *Two elementary schools not listed in the application are listed in the planning paragraph.*
 - b. **P:** *various planning meetings over 4 month period*
2. *Need for Program*
 - a. **P:** *provide demographic data as need for programming (low-income, diverse races, high-rates of multi-lingual students, MEA testing data, parents without high school education).*
3. *Program Design*
 - a. **P:** *specific info on curriculum—project-based, STEAM curriculum*
 - b. **P:** *Students pick clubs*
 - c. **P:** *Proposing increasing the number of students served in previous years and has shown steady increase of children and families served over the previous years*
 - d. **N:** *proposed ratio for homework/tutoring is higher than proposed average.*
 - e. **Elements of High Quality Programming**
 - i. **P:** *Recruit staff from school district*
 - ii. **P:** *Process for hiring is described*
 - iii. **P:** *Describes social emotional safety in safety section*
 - iv. **P:** *students given choices in programming through daily choices and surveys; differentiated projects*
 - v. **P:** *application describes the components of the programming that support attendance*
 - vi. **I/Q:** *same language in the Elements of High-Quality Programming section as another application.*
 - f. **Goals:**
 - i. **I/Q:** *Same academic improvement goals listed as in another application; are these really tailored to the program?*
4. *Program Management*
 - a. **I/Q:** *same language in this section as another application*

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: LearningWorks and Portland (OA/P)
DATE: 4/18/24
EVALUATOR NAME: Jessie Francis
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

- b. **Q:** Program leadership focuses on organizational leadership and provides little information about the leadership of the program.
 - c. **P:** Partners support PD opportunities for staff
 - d. **P:** language translation offered; important for students from families who speak languages other than English as described in demographics.
 - e. **P:** Student transportation provided, exceeds 35% requirement
 - f. **P:** process for background checking volunteers
5. Program Evaluation
- a. **P:** annual program evaluation using various indicators described (YPQA, DOE site visit, data [survey, performance])
 - b. **I:** Iterative, ongoing integration of evaluation

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

III. Budget Proposal

- 1. Budget Narrative
- 2. Budget Forms
- 3. Capacity for Success & Sustainability

1. Budget Narrative

- a. **Q:** Indicates students are not charged fees but then describes how fees would be utilized.
- b. **P:** Describes additional staff time allocated for planning and prep

2. Budget Forms

- a. **P:** Significant in-kind contributions from various sources.
- b. **P:** Fringe benefits included
- c. **P:** braiding in CACFP for student snacks
- d. **P:** 35% of transportation costs provided

3. Capacity for Success & Sustainability

- a. **I/Q:** same language in this section as another application
- b. **P:** Various experiences included on advisory board
- c. **Q:** Sustainability plan lacks specific information on how funding and operations will be sustained; primarily focused on broad explanation of how the organization operates

Priority Points

- 1. Poverty Level
- 2. ESEA Accountability Status
- 3. Other Need

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: LearningWorks and Portland (OA/P)
DATE: 4/18/24
EVALUATOR NAME: Jessie Francis
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Pending info from DOE

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: LearningWorks - Portland - Ocean Ave & Presumpscot
DATE: April 19, 2024
EVALUATOR NAME: Luba Greene
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Instructions: *The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by **individual** evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is **required** that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department's RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.*

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Appendix A – Proposal Cover Page

- Renewal

Appendix B – Debarment, Performance, and Non-Collusion Certification

- no notes

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

- I. *General Information*
 - a. *Abstract*
 - b. *Program Demographics*
 - c. *Partners*

- a. *Abstract*
- b. *Program Demographics = 2 schools @ grades 2-5*
- c. *Partners*
 - *Positive: listed many community partners

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

- II. *Specifications of Work to be Performed*
 1. *Planning*
 2. *Need for Program*

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: LearningWorks - Portland - Ocean Ave & Presumpscot
DATE: April 19, 2024
EVALUATOR NAME: Luba Greene
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

- 3. *Program Design*
- 4. *Program Management*
- 5. *Program Evaluation*

1. Planning:
 - *Met consistently but could have involved schools more in the planning stages
2. Need for Program:
 - Title I schools; high number of ELL and BIPOC students
3. Program Design
 - *Positives: student-selected enrichment clubs, Boston Museum of Science STEAM curriculum; guided by purposeful questions by staff; opportunities to exercise voice & choice & involved in planning process
 - *Positive: Linkages - schools support the programs and Program Director supports progression of the School Improvement Plan; Strong community partnerships providing enrichment in-kind
 - *Interesting: Flexible group experiential learning projects
 - *Interesting: “our student-centered, relationship-based approach cultivates a sense of belonging, ownership & pride.”
4. Program Management
 - ?Question: Seems heavy on leadership with an Executive Director, and Associate Director, two Site Coordinators, and school day staff
 - *Positives: Staff Professional Development aligns with National Afterschool Alliance for core knowledge & competencies; considers language translation at all levels; conducts volunteer orientation;
 - *Innovative: Foster Grandparents program
5. Program Evaluation
 - *Positives: conducts regular & varied evaluations and creates Program Quality Improvement Plans for each site

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

III. Budget Proposal

1. *Budget Narrative*
2. *Budget Forms*
3. *Capacity for Success & Sustainability*

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: LearningWorks - Portland - Ocean Ave & Presumpscot
DATE: April 19, 2024
EVALUATOR NAME: Luba Greene
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

1. Budget Narrative
2. Budget Forms
3. Capacity for Success & Sustainability
 - *Positives: longevity of partnership between school district and LearningWorks; LearningWorks has fiscal controls with visibility in place; LearningWorks has a culture of philanthropy; Opportunities for students to represent the program & learn leadership skills from community partners; Student Leadership Teams; great program promotion ideas; Staff is offered some choice in professional development topics; regular meetings scheduled with school administration
 - *Interesting: Actively engage advisory board members in meaningful activities at meetings; work with partners to set clear roles & expectations around communication to deepen partnership;

Priority Points

1. *Poverty Level*
2. *ESEA Accountability Status*
3. *Other Need*

1. Poverty Level: two schools, one is at 25% Free & Reduced Lunch, the other is at 64%; High poverty communities = 34.5% & 45.8% children living in poverty - higher than the city's average;

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Learning Works (Portland) (OA&P)
DATE: 5/1/24
EVALUATOR NAME: RACHELLE TOME
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Instructions: *The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by **individual** evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is **required** that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department's RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.*

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Appendix A – Proposal Cover Page

- P: Renewal-1 < 40% FRL; 1 > 40%
- P: School year and summer

Appendix B – Debarment, Performance, and Non-Collusion Certification

- P: Signed

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

- I. General Information*
- a. Abstract*
 - b. Program Demographics*
 - c. Partners*

- Q: Indicates collaboration with PPS and community partners. Actual roles not detailed.
- P: School year and summer
- P: Special education and multi-lingual students served
- N: Larger school served (OAES) is less than 40% RFL
- P: Diverse partners, including Ukeleles Heal the World and Maine Audubon

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

- II. Specifications of Work to be Performed*
- 1. Planning*
 - 2. Need for Program*
 - 3. Program Design*

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Learning Works (Portland) (OA&P)
DATE: 5/1/24
EVALUATOR NAME: RACHELLE TOME
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

<p>4. <i>Program Management</i> 5. <i>Program Evaluation</i></p>
--

- 1. N: Narrative 1a mentions capacity at East and Reiche without noting relevance to sites listed in application (OAES and Presumpscot)
- 1. P: Existing programs reviewed to determine adjustments needed.
- 1. P: Focus on SEL and literacy
- 1. N: Parents and students do not appear included in the planning process
- 1. Q: Some planning meetings times appear shorter than the norm
- 2. N: Majority of data referenced is for Portland as a whole.
- 2. P: OA and Presumpscot are Title, with >30% EL
- 2. N: Narrative is general to Portland and does not articulate how the programs will be implemented at the schools cited.
- 3. P: Project based STEAM curriculum modeled after Museum of Science.
- 3. N: Specific types of activities not clearly articulated
- 3. N: Support for ELs not mentioned
- 3. Q: Current trends for staffing and impact on implementation
- 3. P: Ongoing coordination and alignment with PPS policies. Staffing goals prioritizes hiring PPS staff.
- 3. P: Staff experienced with youth development, language arts and STEAM
- 3. N: Specific expectations for staff are clearly outlined
- 3. N: Attention to multi-lingual needs of program participants is not noted even though over 30% are identified as ELs in needs statement
- 3. P: Best practices implemented for emergencies, dismissal, first aid. Training and resource binder provided.
- 3. P: Responsive Classroom; inclusive, respectful environment, respect for socio-economic and cultural diversity.
- 3. P: planning process encourages student voice and choice through surveys, parental input
- 3. P: Flexible grouping and multi-modal projects differentiated with attention to English language proficiency among considerations.
- 3. P: Plan includes adequate measures for supporting regular attendance, including free transportation and following up with absences.
- 4. P: Leadership staff are seasoned administrators
- 4. P: Plan outlines regular collaboration with PPS

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Learning Works (Portland) (OA&P)
DATE: 5/1/24
EVALUATOR NAME: RACHELLE TOME
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

- 4. P: Variety of topics listed for PD including Responsive Classroom and socio-emotional practices
- 4. Q: PD effectiveness determined through staff meeting and follow-up meetings
- 4. P: Communications disseminated by various means. Language interpretation is available.
- 4.P: Transportation expectations are met. PPS covers 35% of the cost SY and 100% cost in summer.
- 4. P: Volunteer screening and orientation provided
- 4. Q: Multiple data sources noted, including use of standardized test scores and report card information, but narrative does clearly articulate how this will be used to evaluate programming.
- 4. P: Annual program evaluation outlined include quantitative and qualitative review.
- 4. P: Quality improvement plans developed
- 4. N: Evaluation reports are shared with the advisory board. No indication of how results are shared with public and used to build community support
-

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

III. Budget Proposal

- 1. Budget Narrative*
- 2. Budget Forms*
- 3. Capacity for Success & Sustainability*

- 1. P: Budget narrative addresses required components.
- 1. I: No indication of use Federal or State funds, PPS in kind only. No references to sustainability of in-kind resources
- 2: Q: \$99864 of additional 21st CCLC funds (002) not mentioned in budget narrative.
- 2. P: 35% transportation costs covered by PPS
- 3. P: Parent (OAES) listed on the advisory board
- 3. P: 15 years of programming. Strategies listed to support sustainability, including building relationships and coordination with several community partners
- 3. P: Consistent involvement of key partners

Priority Points

- 1. Poverty Level*

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Learning Works (Portland) (OA&P)
DATE: 5/1/24
EVALUATOR NAME: RACHELLE TOME
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

<p>2. <i>ESEA Accountability Status</i> 3. <i>Other Need</i></p>
--

- Higher % of BIPOC
- % of students with special education or language needs

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Learning Works and RSU 57
DATE: 4/25/24
EVALUATOR NAME: Jessie Francis
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Instructions: *The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by **individual** evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is **required** that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department's RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.*

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Appendix A – Proposal Cover Page

- Pass

Appendix B – Debarment, Performance, and Non-Collusion Certification

- Pass

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

- I. General Information*
 - a. Abstract*
 - b. Program Demographics*
 - c. Partners*

- Program Demographics
 - **P:** High number of total students served are RLPs= 92%
 - **P:** # of students receiving special education served (33%)
- **Partners**
 - **P:** Various types of partners
 - **N:** would have liked more information on how these partners are involved

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

- II. Specifications of Work to be Performed*
 - 1. Planning*
 - 2. Need for Program*

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Learning Works and RSU 57
DATE: 4/25/24
EVALUATOR NAME: Jessie Francis
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

- 3. *Program Design*
- 4. *Program Management*
- 5. *Program Evaluation*

- 1. *Planning*
 - a. *P: advisory board involved early in planning process*
 - b.
- 2. *Need for Program*
 - a. *P: Demonstration of need with data.*
 - b. *P: Need—lack of out of school activities, economic disadvantage, rural area, low-economic achievement*
- 3. *Program Design*
 - a. *P: specific info on curriculum—project-based, STEAM curriculum*
 - b. *P: Students pick clubs*
 - c. *Q: Meeting minimum hour requirements in school year, exceed in summer by 16 hours—curious if a four hour day for summer will meet the needs described in needs section.*
 - d. *P: Specific examples of linking programming time with in-school time (e.g., PBIS, shared PD, planning meetings and school leadership on advisory boards, provision of data)*
 - e. *P: mentions physical and emotional safety*
 - f. *I/Q: same language in the Elements of High-Quality Programming section as another application.*
 - g. **Elements of High Quality Programming**
 - i. *P: Recruit staff from school district*
 - ii. *P: Process for hiring is described*
 - iii. *P: Describes social emotional safety in safety section*
 - iv. *P: students given choices in programming through daily choices and surveys; differentiated projects*
 - v. *P: application describes the components of the programming that support attendance*
 - h. **Goals:**
 - i. *I/Q: Same academic improvement goals listed as in another application; are these really tailored to the program?*
- 4. *Program Management*
 - a. *I/Q: same language in this section as another application*

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Learning Works and RSU 57
DATE: 4/25/24
EVALUATOR NAME: Jessie Francis
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

- b. **Q:** Program leadership focuses on organizational leadership and provides little information about the leadership of the program.
 - c. **P:** Partners support PD opportunities for staff
 - d. **P:** language translation offered; important for students from families who speak languages other than English as described in demographics.
 - e. **P:** Student transportation provided, exceeds 35% requirement
 - f. **P:** process for background checking volunteers
5. Program Evaluation
- a. **I/Q:** same language in this section as another application
 - b. **P:** annual program evaluation using various indicators described (YPQA, DOE site visit, data [survey, performance])
 - c. **I:** Iterative, ongoing integration of evaluation

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

III. Budget Proposal

- 1. Budget Narrative
- 2. Budget Forms
- 3. Capacity for Success & Sustainability

- 1. Budget Narrative
 - a. **Q:** Indicates students are not charged fees but then describes how fees would be utilized.
 - b. **P:** Describes additional staff time allocated for planning and prep
- 2. Budget Forms
 - a. **P:** Significant in-kind contributions from various sources.
 - b. **P:** Fringe benefits included
 - c. **P:** 35% of transportation costs provided
- 3. Capacity for Success & Sustainability
 - a. **I/Q:** same language in this section as another application
 - b. **P:** Superintendent and assistant superintendent plus Principal included on advisory board
 - c. **N:** No one not connected to the school or Learning works is serving on the advisory board
 - d. **Q:** Sustainability plan lacks specific information on how funding and operations will be sustained; primarily focused on broad explanation of how the organization operates

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Learning Works and RSU 57
DATE: 4/25/24
EVALUATOR NAME: Jessie Francis
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

<p><i>Priority Points</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. <i>Poverty Level</i>2. <i>ESEA Accountability Status</i>3. <i>Other Need</i>

Pending info from DOE

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: LearningWorks - RSU 57
DATE: April 19, 2024
EVALUATOR NAME: Luba Greene
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Instructions: *The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by **individual** evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is **required** that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department's RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.*

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Appendix A – Proposal Cover Page

- Renewal

Appendix B – Debarment, Performance, and Non-Collusion Certification

- no notes

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

I. General Information

- a. Abstract*
- b. Program Demographics*
- c. Partners*

- a. Abstract
- b. Program Demographics = Grades 2-5
- c. Partners:
*Positive: strong list of partners

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

II. Specifications of Work to be Performed

- 1. Planning*
- 2. Need for Program*
- 3. Program Design*

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: LearningWorks - RSU 57
DATE: April 19, 2024
EVALUATOR NAME: Luba Greene
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

- | |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">4. <i>Program Management</i>5. <i>Program Evaluation</i> |
|---|

- 1. Planning
 - *Negative: would like to see more school involvement in planning process
- 2. Need for Program
 - *Positives: High number of total LP students 179/325 in school; existing program of 8 years deemed successful by district; closest YMCA raised costs, no transportation, no academic programming; goals to improve Social-Emotional and Literacy programming
- 3. Program Design
 - *Negative: "LearningWorks AfterSchool is regarded as one of Waterboro Elementary School's most robust OST (Out of School Time) programs." this sounds almost AI generated or copied and pasted (p.12)
 - *Positives: student-selected enrichment clubs, Boston Museum of Science STEAM curriculum; guided by purposeful questions by staff; opportunities to exercise voice & choice & involved in planning process
 - *Interesting: Flexible group experiential learning projects
- 4. Program Management
 - *Positives: Director has teaching and 21stCCLC experience; staff trained on Responsive Classroom techniques; linkages to school and seamless transition in same building;
 - *Negatives: would like to hear more specifics about volunteers, recruitment and roles
- 5. Program Evaluation
 - *Positives: is comprehensive and varied; YPQA and DOE site visits

<p><i>Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget</i></p>
--

<p><i>III. Budget Proposal</i></p>

- | |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">1. <i>Budget Narrative</i>2. <i>Budget Forms</i>3. <i>Capacity for Success & Sustainability</i> |
|---|

- 1. Budget Narrative
- 2. Budget Forms
- 3. Capacity for Success & Sustainability

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: LearningWorks - RSU 57
DATE: April 19, 2024
EVALUATOR NAME: Luba Greene
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

*Positives: in-kind donations from school district; longevity of partnership between school district and LearningWorks; LearningWorks has fiscal controls with visibility in place; LearningWorks has a culture of philanthropy; Opportunities for students to represent the program & learn leadership skills from community partners; Student Leadership Teams; great program promotion ideas; Staff is offered some choice in professional development topics; regular meetings scheduled with school administration

*Interesting: Continually refining annual appeal process

Priority Points

1. *Poverty Level*
2. *ESEA Accountability Status*
3. *Other Need*

1. Poverty Level:

*Free & Reduced Lunch rate at 25%

3. Other Need:

*High number of total LP students: 179/325 at the school

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Learning Works (RSU 57)
DATE: 5/1/24
EVALUATOR NAME: RACHELLE TOME
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Instructions: *The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by **individual** evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is **required** that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department's RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.*

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Appendix A – Proposal Cover Page

- I: Renewal-1 school 25% FRL

Appendix B – Debarment, Performance, and Non-Collusion Certification

- P: Signed

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

I. General Information

- a. Abstract*
- b. Program Demographics*
- c. Partners*

- P: Operates SY and summer
- Q: Indicates collaboration with PPS and community partners. Actual roles not detailed.
- P: Special education and multi-lingual students served
- I: 55% of students served are RLP
- P: Partners include UNE and MMSA

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

II. Specifications of Work to be Performed

- 1. Planning*
- 2. Need for Program*
- 3. Program Design*

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Learning Works (RSU 57)
DATE: 5/1/24
EVALUATOR NAME: RACHELLE TOME
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

<p>4. <i>Program Management</i> 5. <i>Program Evaluation</i></p>
--

- 1. P: Existing programs reviewed to determine adjustments needed.
- 1. P: Focus on SEL and literacy
- 1. N: Parents and students do not appear included in the planning process
- 1. I: Majority of meetings (1 hour) are conducted by LW team
- 2. P: Program need justified by local economics, lack of transportation and lack access to available YMCA programs.
- 3. P: Project based STEAM curriculum modeled after Museum of Science.
- 3. N: Specific types of activities not clearly articulated
- 3. Q: What are current trends for staffing and impact on implementation
- 3. P: Ongoing coordination and alignment with WES policies. Staffing goals prioritizes hiring WES staff.
- 3. P: Staff experienced with youth development, language arts and STEAM
- 3. N: Specific expectations for staff are not clearly outlined
- 3. P: Best practices implemented for emergencies, dismissal, first aid. Training and resource binder provided.
- 3. P: Responsive Classroom; inclusive, respectful environment, respect for socio-economic and cultural diversity.
- 3. P: Planning process encourages student voice and choice through surveys, parental input
- 3. P: Flexible grouping and multi-modal projects differentiated with attention to English language proficiency among considerations.
- 3. P: Plan includes adequate measures for supporting regular attendance, including free transportation and following up with absences.
- 4. P: Leadership staff are seasoned administrators
- 4. P: Plan outlines regular collaboration with RSU 57
- 4. P: Variety of topics listed for PD including Responsive Classroom and socio-emotional practices
- 4. Q: PD effectiveness determined through staff meeting and follow-up meetings
- 4. P: Communications disseminated by various means. Translation services are available.
- 4.P: Transportation expectations are met. RSU 57 covers 35% of the cost SY and 100% cost in summer.
- 4. P: Volunteer screening and orientation provided

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Learning Works (RSU 57)
DATE: 5/1/24
EVALUATOR NAME: RACHELLE TOME
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

- 4. Q: Multiple data sources noted, including use of standardized test scores and report card information, but narrative does clearly articulate how this will be used to evaluate programming.
- 4. P: Annual program evaluation outlined includes quantitative and qualitative review.
- 4. P: Quality improvement plans developed
- 4. N: Evaluation reports are shared with the advisory board. No indication of how results are shared with the public and used to build community support.
-

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

III. Budget Proposal

- 1. Budget Narrative*
- 2. Budget Forms*
- 3. Capacity for Success & Sustainability*

- 1. P: Budget narrative addresses required components.
- 1. I: No indication of use Federal or State funds, RSU 57 in kind only. No references to sustainability of in-kind resources
- 2. P: 35% transportation costs covered by RSU 57
- 2. I: Majority of 21st CCLC funding supports staffing
- 3. N: No parents listed on the advisory board; no members outside of RSU 57 and LW
- 3. P: 15 years of programming. Strategies listed to support sustainability, including building relationships and coordination with several community partners.
- 3. P: Consistent involvement of key partners

Priority Points

- 1. Poverty Level*
- 2. ESEA Accountability Status*
- 3. Other Need*

- Poverty
- Limited access to other nearby programs due to rural location

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: RSU 17 MSAD 17 & Bryant Pond
DATE: 5/15/24
EVALUATOR NAME: Jessie Francis
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Instructions: *The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by **individual** evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is **required** that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department's RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.*

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Appendix A – Proposal Cover Page

- Pass

Appendix B – Debarment, Performance, and Non-Collusion Certification

- Pass

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

- I. General Information*
 - a. Abstract*
 - b. Program Demographics*
 - c. Partners*

II. N: Number of students in the grades served and # LP not listed.

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

- III. Specifications of Work to be Performed*
 - 1. Planning*
 - 2. Need for Program*
 - 3. Program Design*
 - 4. Program Management*
 - 5. Program Evaluation*

- *Planning*
 - **Q:** *Limited number of planning hours listed (5.5)*

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: RSU 17 MSAD 17 & Bryant Pond
DATE: 5/15/24
EVALUATOR NAME: Jessie Francis
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

- **Q:** August 2023 date listed between the other two planning dates are in Jan and Feb 2024. Is this accurate or a mistake?
- **Need for Program**
 - **P:** Need for program described with data (Students performing below expectations, chronic absenteeism, economically disadvantaged households, homelessness, limited district funded afterschool activities outside of athletics)
 - **P:** Section describes how the program would meet these needs
- **Program Design**
 - **P:** range of activities described (academic, homework, STEM, art, sports, clubs)
 - **Q:** Mentions BARR team meetings but does not explain the acronym or the bidder or district's involvement in the BARR model.
 - **P:** exceeds the hours required in the school year by a significant amount
 - **N:** does not meet the required hours in the summer
 - **P:** Meets the required staff to student ratios
 - **P:** Plan to hire certified teachers and provide them with planning time to carryout rigorous lesson planning
 - **P:** Mentions physical and emotional safety and background vetting of adults
 - **P:** Student choice in club opportunities and a flexible schedule
 - **Q:** application describes providing "activity bussing three days a week" – unclear what this means in relation to the transportation requirement of the RFP
 - **P:** actionable strategies for promoting attendance described
 - **Goals**
 - **Q:** Very high academic targets proposed; are these realistic?
 - **P:** Goal activities seem to align with need described in the application.
 - **Q:** Goals only seem to be written around the school-year 40 week timeline, unclear how the proposed summer programming integrates in
 - **Q:** limited fundraising goal targets, including \$0 in year one.
- **Program Management**
 - **P:** requirements and quals of the director described and integration into the current structure and supervision.
 - **P:** Program staff will have access to PD in collaboration with the district

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: RSU 17 MSAD 17 & Bryant Pond
DATE: 5/15/24
EVALUATOR NAME: Jessie Francis
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

- **Q:** *As noted above, in the transportation section it is unclear if transportation will be provided on all five days of the afterschool program as only three days are listed.*
- **Program Evaluation**
 - **P:** Plan to align with 21stCCLC “measures of effectiveness”
 - **Q:** categories of data to be collected are included (academic improvement data, attendance rates) but other specific data points are not noted.
 - **Q:** Mentions STAR assessment data but does not explain acronym or reference
 - **P:** Plan for program to meet with principal quarterly to review data, analyze trends and make plans for improvement.
 - **P:** Inclusion of observations and regular feedback from students and staff

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

IV. Budget Proposal

- 1. Budget Narrative*
- 2. Budget Forms*
- 3. Capacity for Success & Sustainability*

- **Budget Narrative**
 - **P:** Includes cost per RLP - \$852.27 per 176
 - **Q:** This is quite low. Is it realistic?
 - **P:** No fees to be charged
 - **Q:** 10 club advisors are described but I don’t see where in the application the 10 clubs are laid out.
- **Budget Forms:**
 - **N:** No in-kind or funding from other sources listed on budget forms yet throughout the application there is a partnership described between district and Bryant Pond that indicates in-kind funding would be likely and this program seems to implement as described without in-kind from the school district or other partners.
 - **P:** Appreciate the pay rate provided to staff in the program.
 - **N:** Tutors and club advisors are only budgeted for 40 weeks of the year; this only covers the school-year programming and not the four weeks of summer. How would summer programming be operated?
 - **N:** District is not providing 35% transportation match required by the RFP
- **Capacity for Success & Sustainability**
 - **Q:** Three person advisory board is proposed.

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: RSU 17 MSAD 17 & Bryant Pond
DATE: 5/15/24
EVALUATOR NAME: Jessie Francis
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

- **P:** Several actionable steps described in sustainability plan including ensuring program success through annual review and seeking additional funding sources

Priority Points

1. *Poverty Level*
2. *ESEA Accountability Status*
3. *Other Need*

chronic absenteeism, economically disadvantaged households, homelessness

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: RSU 17 - Bryant Pond
DATE: May 18, 2024
EVALUATOR NAME: Luba Greene
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Instructions: The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by **individual** evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is **required** that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department's RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Appendix A – Proposal Cover Page

- Expansion

Appendix B – Debarment, Performance, and Non-Collusion Certification

- no notes here

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

- I. General Information
 - a. Abstract
 - b. Program Demographics
 - c. Partners**

- Abstract -
- Program Demographics - one school, grades 7-8, 44% F&R Lunch; (*Question about some of these numbers: 1,000 Parents to be served and no numbers in Site Section p.8)
- Partners - only one partner listed (Bryant Pond 4-H Camp) and no other partners listed here

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

- II. Specifications of Work to be Performed
 1. Planning
 2. Need for Program
 3. Program Design

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: RSU 17 - Bryant Pond
DATE: May 18, 2024
EVALUATOR NAME: Luba Greene
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

- | |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">4. Program Management5. Program Evaluation |
|---|

- Planning - admin and BARR meetings recognized demand for regular academic interventions; student/family feedback indicate a need for after-school club and enrichment offerings; (*Negative -Only 3 meetings listed in the planning process)
- Need for Program -indicated 44.7% performing below grade level on state testing the previous year, and a 37% chronic absenteeism rate; 46% from economically disadvantaged households; 2% experiencing homelessness; absence of district funding opportunities for co-curricular activities beyond athletics & challenge of finding volunteers;
- Program Design - “Viking Adventure Clubs” - (*Positive -“to provide opportunities for students to explore and develop new skills in a supportive environment”); Linkages - BARR meeting referral process; coordinator w/interventionists to identify and monitor
Instructional Leadership - Certified teachers; tutors & classroom teachers receive time to collaborate; instructors monitor and assess student progress
Safe & Appropriate - Discussed open lines of communication; volunteers & staff vetted & background checks completed; clear behavioral expectations & conflict resolution strategies
Student-Driven - clubs meeting on different days to provide flexible scheduling; activity bus 3x/week; incentives & special events for consistent attendance; open communication with families;
- Program Management
Program Leadership - full time director with education and related/relevant experience; supervised by Middle School Principal
School Leadership - it sounds like the roles are well-defined and transparent fostering accountability at all levels
Staff & PD - describes program staff participation in school-day opportunities as appropriate to programming and best practices; (*Would have liked to have heard more about program staff PD expectations, # of hours, or types of common trainings, any for certifications?)
Communication/Information - program information and results shared through various channels, spot on school district’s website, newsletters, direct communications with the community

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: RSU 17 - Bryant Pond
DATE: May 18, 2024
EVALUATOR NAME: Luba Greene
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Transportation - (*Question about wording - “Transport to the sites will be provided by school buses...” - what sites are meant here? is it Hebron Academy and Oxford Hills Christian Academy?)

Volunteers - recruited by the Program Director; vetted as per district policies; will assist in filling a variety of needs

- Program Evaluation

Program’s effectiveness guided by the 21st CCLC “measures of effectiveness”; STAR assessment data and attendance records; survey data from families, students & the community; Establishment of Performance Measures - improving STAR math & reading scores & attendance; researching to identify evidence-based intervention strategies; focus on alignment with school in terms of academic programming & needs of students; data collection to ensure continuous improvement

Periodic; quarterly program director & OHMS principal to review data, trends, plans for improvement, feedback from variety of sources including stakeholders & form program action plan; program director conduct regular observations, collecting feedback to inform efforts; quarterly newsletter

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

III. Budget Proposal

1. Budget Narrative
2. Budget Forms
3. Capacity for Success & Sustainability

- Budget Narrative - \$852.27 per RLP student (low); no fees; club stipends & tutors, \$ food for snacks; \$ to Director & Staff PD
- Budget Forms (*Negative - nothing under In-Kind Contributions); Would have liked to have seen more resources for food/snacks such as CACFP via the school district if possible; zero for Telephone for director - is this in-kind from district? or is that “essential administrative needs” (unclear)
- Capacity for Success & Sustainability
Advisory Board has minimal number of members - would like to see more participation from community, parents
Sustainability Plan - these are great ideas, but I’m wondering since this is an expansion grant, what things around these ideas are already being done, what partnerships already exist, what community support has there been?
(*Positive - already existing partnership with Bryant Pond 4-H Camp, even into the school day, reciprocal professional development opportunities)

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: RSU 17 - Bryant Pond
DATE: May 18, 2024
EVALUATOR NAME: Luba Greene
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Priority Points

1. Poverty Level
2. ESEA Accountability Status
3. Other Need

- Poverty Level - 44% F&R Lunch;
- ESEA Accountability Status
- Other Need - 44.7% performing below grade level on state testing the previous year, and a 37% chronic absenteeism rate; 46% from economically disadvantaged households; 2% experiencing homelessness; absence of district funding opportunities for co-curricular activities beyond athletics & challenge of finding volunteers;

Appendix D:

?Question - are the proposed academic achievement outcome goals attainable? (they seem very high)

(*Negative - Would like to have read more specific examples in this section for all areas of enrichment programming strategies and activities)

(*Negative -Family Engagement & Education - would have liked to have read more specific examples here too, maybe some titles of engagement events, ways to be creative here)

(Same with Sustainability & Collaboration - some specific ideas? how will you grow your funding sources to increase so much in years 3 and 4?)

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: RSU 17 (Bryant Pond)
DATE: 5/1/24
EVALUATOR NAME: RACHELLE TOME
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Instructions: *The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by **individual** evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is **required** that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department's RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.*

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Appendix A – Proposal Cover Page

- P: Expansion-1 >40% FRL

Appendix B – Debarment, Performance, and Non-Collusion Certification

- P: Signed

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

- I. General Information*
- a. Abstract*
 - b. Program Demographics*
 - c. Partners*

- P: Collaboration with Bryant Pond for outdoor education, youth development
- N: Abstract does not indicate summer programming
- N: Chart is not completed, even though only one school is listed
- P: School year program
- P: Special education and multi-lingual students included in demographics
- N: Single partner

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

- II. Specifications of Work to be Performed*
- 1. Planning*
 - 2. Need for Program*
 - 3. Program Design*
 - 4. Program Management*
 - 5. Program Evaluation*

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: RSU 17 (Bryant Pond)
DATE: 5/1/24
EVALUATOR NAME: RACHELLE TOME
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

- 1. N: Limited planning time (5.5 hours)
- 1. Q: Narrative mentions student/parent feedback
- 2. P: Data for poverty and homelessness; need for after school opportunities for academic support and safety
- 3. P: Narrative includes opportunities for academic support and a variety of enrichment possibilities, such as STEM and the arts
- 3. P: Targeted recruitment, feedback from students, communication and incentives to promote ongoing participation.
- 3. I: Programming includes summer and SY support (not clear in narratives)
- 3. P: Collaboration with school day academic and intervention programs, including BARR
- 3. Q: Specific details regarding collaboration not clearly described. Limited mostly to program coordinator.
- 3. P: Expectations for staff are outlined and includes time for collaborating with classroom teachers
- 3. P: Adequate safety measures are described
- 3. P: Flexible structure allows for student choice
- 3 Q: Activity bussing is provided for 3 days a week, but the program is planned for 5 days in SY, 4 days in the summer. Attendance appears flexible and based on space availability. Clarity is needed.
- 4. P: Expectations for leadership are outlined.
- 4. Q: District staff are tasked with a variety of responsibilities. Plan for ensuring implementation is not outlined.
- 4. P: PD offered through coordination with the district. Effectiveness evaluated through surveys and observation.
- 4. P: Program feedback collected through surveys from various groups. Dissemination will be through various avenues.
- 4. Q: Transportation is provided through different options including parental arrangements. Program impacts?
- 4. N: Volunteer availability? Earlier narrative indicated challenges acquiring volunteers.
- 5. P: Use of STAR math and reading data, attendance and survey data for objective sources.
- 5. N: Details on how evaluation will be performed are not available.
- 5. P: Quarterly meetings using various data sources and observations for program evaluation. This will inform reviews and plans for adjustments

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: RSU 17 (Bryant Pond)
DATE: 5/1/24
EVALUATOR NAME: RACHELLE TOME
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

-
-

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

III. Budget Proposal

- 1. Budget Narrative*
- 2. Budget Forms*
- 3. Capacity for Success & Sustainability*

- 1. Q: Budget narrative indicates 176 RLP while Section 1 demographics say 175 addresses required components.
- 1. N: Narrative references Federal, state funds but does not identify specifics.
- 1. N: Minimal reference to sustainability of in-kind resources
- 3. N: Project totally funded by 21st CCLC
- 3. N: Transportation costs are \$5000; shows no contribution from district.
- 4. Q: Advisory board- 3 members, no parents listed
- 4. Q: Sustainability plan lists steps and partnerships that do not currently appear to be in place. Actions are listed, but details for how are not included.
- 4. P: Partnership with Bryant Pond 4-H

Priority Points

- 1. Poverty Level*
- 2. ESEA Accountability Status*
- 3. Other Need*

- Chronic absenteeism
- Homelessness

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: RSU 17 MSAD 17 and West Paris Explorers
DATE: 5/19/24
EVALUATOR NAME: Jessie Francis
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Instructions: *The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by **individual** evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is **required** that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department's RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.*

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Appendix A – Proposal Cover Page

- Pass

Appendix B – Debarment, Performance, and Non-Collusion Certification

- Pass

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

- I. *General Information*
 - a. *Abstract*
 - b. *Program Demographics*
 - c. *Partners*

II. *Pass*

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

- III. *Specifications of Work to be Performed*
 1. *Planning*
 2. *Need for Program*
 3. *Program Design*
 4. *Program Management*
 5. *Program Evaluation*

- *Planning*

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: RSU 17 MSAD 17 and West Paris Explorers
DATE: 5/19/24
EVALUATOR NAME: Jessie Francis
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

- *P: Planning period from January to April; clear description of the planning process*
- *Need for Program*
 - *P: Need for program described with data (e.g., Maine Kids Count data—poverty, chronic absenteeism, academic data, lack of employment opportunities, lack of arts or other children’s activities)*
 - *N: Section doesn’t describe how the program will meet these needs*
- *Program Design*
 - *P: Significant of hours over the required school year and summer minimums*
 - *P: Low academic ratio during school year; especially supportive for age group*
 - *P: clear examples of how afterschool will coordinate with school day*
 - *P: Teachers from the district*
 - *P: clear strategies to promote attendance with intermittent check-ins*
 - **Goals**
 - *P: Rigorous academic targets suggested*
 - *Q: academic targets do not increase year over year*
 - *P: This section makes clear that the early release Wednesday will play into the high number of hours proposed earlier in the application; that would have been helpful to have described.*
- *Program Management*
 - *P: evaluation for staff*
 - *N: Did not describe any types of PD the staff may need to engage in after their evaluations*
 - *P: Onboarding and vetting of volunteers described; it will fit in with district practices.*
- *Program Evaluation*
 - *P: Evaluation will be integrated with the school’s comprehensive needs assessment/schoolwide plan*
 - *P: Some specific data points described including academics and survey data*
 - *P: ongoing/continuous evaluation*
 - *Q: Specific timeline not provided*
 - *P: information to be shared with parents at a Title I Parent Meeting and annually to school board; also posted online.*

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: RSU 17 MSAD 17 and West Paris Explorers
DATE: 5/19/24
EVALUATOR NAME: Jessie Francis
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

IV. Budget Proposal

1. *Budget Narrative*
2. *Budget Forms*
3. *Capacity for Success & Sustainability*

- Budget Narrative
 - **P:** Cost per RLP = \$2500 (@ 40)
 - **Q:** Narrative indicates school will pay 29% of bus transportation
 - **N:** Plan for charging fees is vague “targeted students are offered the program at no cost and additional slots are offered on a sliding scale” and no fee structure is provided
- Budget Forms:
 - **Q:** in-kind budget form indicates district will pay 33% of transportation (conflicts with budget statement)
 - **N:** district does not meet the 35% transportation match described in the RFP
 - **P:** Significant amount of in-kind coming into the program
- *Capacity for Success & Sustainability*
 - **Q:** no advisory board members from outside the partner organizations
 - **P:** Application describes seeking new partners and funding opportunities (Grants) and gives some specific examples
 - **Q:** Unclear how fees play into the sustainability plan given the lack of information provided elsewhere in the application; this section indicates “the biggest boost will be helping parents to be able to pay nominal fees” – further unclear how much parents will be asked to provide, for which students, and how this will work into the overall sustainability plan. The language “biggest boost” implies it could be significant.

Priority Points

1. *Poverty Level*
2. *ESEA Accountability Status*
3. *Other Need*

chronic absenteeism, lack of employment opportunities, lack of arts or other children’s activities

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: RSU 17 - West Paris Explorers
DATE: May 18, 2024
EVALUATOR NAME: Luba Greene
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Instructions: The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by **individual** evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is **required** that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department's RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Appendix A – Proposal Cover Page

- Renewal

Appendix B – Debarment, Performance, and Non-Collusion Certification

- no notes here

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

- I. General Information
 - a. Abstract
 - b. Program Demographics
 - c. Partners

- Abstract - long-existing program with long history of collaboration; goals to strengthen partnerships
- Program Demographics - one elementary school PK-6; 56% LP students; numbers seem reasonable
- Partners - only 3 partners listed; small community with high poverty

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

- II. Specifications of Work to be Performed
 1. Planning
 2. Need for Program
 3. Program Design
 4. Program Management

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: RSU 17 - West Paris Explorers
DATE: May 18, 2024
EVALUATOR NAME: Luba Greene
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

5. Program Evaluation

- Planning - would like to see more community / partners involvement in the planning process
- Need for Program - 50% F&R Lunch; high community poverty rate limiting opportunities; chronic absenteeism at 34%; no large employers & only a few small businesses, no arts/dance/karate venues; employed parents rely on after school program because they commute out of town for their work; (*Positive - is supported by town budget each year at \$6,000)
- Program Design - 6-week cycles during school year with themes around safety, social/emotional learning or language experiences; (*Question - what are they doing to resolve the difficulty in finding skilled staff?)
Linkages - using STAR data to determine standards for focused instruction in tutoring and highlighted in STEM & Literacy activities; planning time with teachers made available; (*Positive - coordinate with Title I family activities)
Instructional Leadership - Director works with school day staff and community for programming and training opportunities; tutors are school day teachers;
Safe & Appropriate - DHHS regulations, annual inspections; staff are First Aid & CPR certified, hires Red Cross Water Safety Instructors for summer program; training staff with emotional regulation strategies for students
Student-Driven - choose between two choices; students set goals with their classroom teachers;
Regular attendees - some incentives listed, would like to hear more details / examples
- Program Management
Program Leadership - longtime director with degree in education field; established relationships school and families; DHHS childcare licensing knowledge/experience
School Leadership - school staff refers, sets goals for, and monitors progress of students; PD is shared with program staff as appropriate; school district managing administrative and fiscal responsibilities; tutors & summer school teachers are school district employees
Staff & PD - evaluation tool for program staff to use & set goals /monitor growth in key knowledge and skills areas (self-assessment & evaluation by director)
Communication - plans to share in person, via social media with permission; (*Negative - would have liked to have read more details / examples for this section)

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: RSU 17 - West Paris Explorers
DATE: May 18, 2024
EVALUATOR NAME: Luba Greene
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Volunteers - follows school district policy for vetting volunteers; volunteer training provided. Using local senior citizens and tech school's childcare class students.

- Program Evaluation - program work guided by the school's Comprehensive Needs Assessment / Schoolwide Plan process; The Renaissance System (STAR) and Freckle will be used to provide guidance on next learning targets for students; RLP students assessed 3x/year, with the school's Intervention team analyzing the results on a monthly basis(?) - Parent and students surveyed after each 6-week cycle, reported to Advisory Committee quarterly, with adjustments to programming made ; Principal reports to school board 1x/year; Director reports to Town budget committee 1x/year and is regular practice

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

- III. Budget Proposal
1. Budget Narrative
 2. Budget Forms
 3. Capacity for Success & Sustainability

- Budget Narrative - cost per RLP student is \$2500; no fees for RLP students, others on a sliding fee scale which provides for basic staffing ratios; supported by town budget; Title I family event collaboration reduces costs to program; in-kind support through district and community agencies; refers to extensive in-kind list; would like to see other sources for Food such as participation in the CACFP if possible;
- Budget Forms - missing details under supplies line
- Capacity for Success & Sustainability - more school involvement leading to more integrated systems for targeting students for intervention; Title I coordination; Goals to find more agencies to partner with and to drive costs down and to drive the understanding of the importance of enrichment activities; Seven Advisory Board members; variety in roles; appreciated the examples of Community Concepts, The Front Porch project, and Parent Forums

Priority Points

1. Poverty Level
2. ESEA Accountability Status
3. Other Need

- Poverty Level - 50% F&R Lunch status
- ESEA Accountability Status

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: RSU 17 - West Paris Explorers
DATE: May 18, 2024
EVALUATOR NAME: Luba Greene
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

- Other Need - high community poverty rate limiting opportunities; chronic absenteeism at 34%; no large employers & only a few small businesses, no arts/dance/karate venues; employed parents rely on after school program because they commute out of town for their work;

Appendix D:

Appreciated the details about students developing goals in collaboration with their tutor & teacher for each 6 week cycle.

(*Positives - Early Release Day activities around safety topics; Read Aloud with a focus during snack time; collaboration with Community Concepts for parent education; varied times for parent education; promotion strategies & activities (Presentations))

Fundraising goals sound high based on community poverty and lack of businesses, bidder acknowledges that this may result in more in-kind donations than financial
Professional Development goal of 20 hours sounds high

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: RSU 17 (West Paris Explorers)
DATE: 5/22/24
EVALUATOR NAME: RACHELLE TOME
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Instructions: *The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by **individual** evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is **required** that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department's RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.*

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Appendix A – Proposal Cover Page

- P: Renewal-1 > 50% FRL
- I: \$100,000

Appendix B – Debarment, Performance, and Non-Collusion Certification

- P: Signed

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

- I. General Information*
- a. Abstract*
 - b. Program Demographics*
 - c. Partners*

- P: Improving an existing program. Includes parent education.
- I: Total served 60; RLP 40, Cost per \$2500.
- P: Partners: West Paris Explorers, Community Concepts, Library

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

- II. Specifications of Work to be Performed*
- 1. Planning*
 - 2. Need for Program*
 - 3. Program Design*
 - 4. Program Management*
 - 5. Program Evaluation*

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: RSU 17 (West Paris Explorers)
DATE: 5/22/24
EVALUATOR NAME: RACHELLE TOME
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

- 1a. Ongoing collaboration between partners.
- 1b. Meetings Jan 2024-Mar 2024 9.5 hours
- 1b. Names only, no affiliation
- 2.P: Several needs are identified, including academic, socio-emotional health (33% vs 45% for district), finances (16% avg. poverty). No local activities available. Out of town for work, child care needs.
- 3.1a. Academic support and enrichment, 6-week cycles, summer programming.
- 3.1b. I: 1 sites; PK-6
- 3.1b. Previous program experienced challenges due to COVID.
- 3.1c. Program hours exceed required minimums, student to staff ratios reasonable- adjusted for tutoring needs.
- 3.2a. Monthly planning meetings with school and Explorers. Includes RTI plans and use of STAR data.
- 3.2b. Director- BS/BA in education. Experience with program elements, scheduling PD, communication, coordination with Explorers and school staff.
- 3.2c Alignment with school policies and procedures. Explorers staff will train with school staff on several topics including trauma informed practice and strategies for emotional regulation.
- 3.2d. Age/ grade level pods. Student choice for two options.
- 3.2e. Referral to program by staff and parents. Scheduling options for 1, 2 or more days. Incentives to encourage participation. Communication with parents.
- 3.3 Expectations for % of overall academic improvement for math/ literacy appear ambitious.
- 3.3 Opportunities to participate in selection of physical activity options. 2 x weekly
- 3.3 6-week cycles on STEM projects
- 3.3 Reasonable parent involvement opportunities including sessions from Community Concepts Parent Educator.
- 3.4a. Current director has a bachelor's degrees and several years of experience in the role. Any replacement would require the same level of experience and skill set.
- 3.4b. School staff will monitor student progress. PD will be made available to Explorer staff. Tutors and summer school staff will be school employees.
- 3.4c. Evaluation tool for staff to determine needs and set goals. Continuous cycle of review to determine effectiveness and needed changes.
- 3.4d. In person communication when possible. Use of social media to reach the community.

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: RSU 17 (West Paris Explorers)
DATE: 5/22/24
EVALUATOR NAME: RACHELLE TOME
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

- 3.4e. Transportation to Legion Annex.
- 3.4e. Q. No information about transportation for summer programming.
- 3.4f. Volunteers are parents, when possible. Other groups are listed for potential recruitment.
- 3.5a. Use of CNA to guide programming. Data from Children Alliance and Star Assessment. Student and parent surveys. Performance monitored by director.
- 3.5b. Continuous cycle of improvement. Monthly meeting with staff to evaluate progress. Parent and student survey data is reviewed every 6 weeks. Quarterly reports to advisory committee.
- 3.5c. Review cycle informs progress with adjustments made as needed. Program report shared at annual Title I Parent meeting. Annual reports to School Board.

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

III. Budget Proposal

- 1. Budget Narrative*
- 2. Budget Forms*
- 3. Capacity for Success & Sustainability*

- 1a. Cost per \$2500.
- 1c. Targeted students-no cost, additional slots-sliding scale.
- 1d. Use of Title I, local contributions.
- 1e. Purpose is outlined.
- 1f. In-kind funding (\$35,500; 3 sources) not detailed in the narrative.
- 2. (001) \$2000 for 33% transportation costs.
- 2. (002) Program funding \$15,000?
- 2. (005) 35% transportation requirement not met. 33% are covered by district.
- 3a. Advisory board includes parents.
- 3b. Imbedded school involvement. “Growing ownership”. Expanding partners for Explorers. Additional grants, increased collaborations with local businesses.
- 3c. Consistent involvement of key partners including 20+ years of before and after school programming.

Priority Points

- 1. Poverty Level*
- 2. ESEA Accountability Status*
- 3. Other Need*

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: RSU 17 (West Paris Explorers)
DATE: 5/22/24
EVALUATOR NAME: RACHELLE TOME
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

- Child care needs
- Economic disadvantage. 16%
- Lack of local activities
- 34% Chronic absenteeism
- 33% positive response on Social/emotional survey (45% district)

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: RSU 24 and Maine Seacoast Mission
DATE: 5/19/24
EVALUATOR NAME: Jessie Francis
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Instructions: *The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by **individual** evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is **required** that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department's RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.*

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Appendix A – Proposal Cover Page

- Pass

Appendix B – Debarment, Performance, and Non-Collusion Certification

- Pass

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

- I. *General Information*
 - a. *Abstract*
 - b. *Program Demographics*
 - c. *Partners*

II. *Pass*

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

- III. *Specifications of Work to be Performed*
 1. *Planning*
 2. *Need for Program*
 3. *Program Design*
 4. *Program Management*
 5. *Program Evaluation*

- *Planning*
 - **P:** *Long planning period, beginning in November.*

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: RSU 24 and Maine Seacoast Mission
DATE: 5/19/24
EVALUATOR NAME: Jessie Francis
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

- *P: Multiple partners involved in the planning process; planning process included a student, parent, and community survey*
- *Need for Program*
 - *P: Need for program described with data (limited out-of-school-time opportunities, high poverty, academic data, high food insecurity)*
 - *P: Section speaks to how this program will address the needs described above.*
- *Program Design*
 - *P: Hours exceed minimum requirements; long summer days.*
 - *P: Meets required ratios; exceeds ratio for tutoring and recreational activities*
 - *P: Significant relationships between afterschool and district described; school teachers, shared curriculums, goals, policies, etc.*
 - *I: Students can meet proficiency standards through afterschool activities*
 - *P: Safety section speaks to physical and psychological safety as well as how PBIS and behavioral and emotional supports contribute to student success*
 - **Goals**
 - *P: Rigorous academic goals that increase over the four years*
 - *P: Detailed goals and activities, align with other needs and programming described in the application*
- *Program Management*
 - *P: Current director has 21st CCLC experience; section describes background and quals for this position*
 - *P: Recruitment, screening, and vetting process described for volunteers*
- *Program Evaluation*
 - *P: Early-year programming will use fall assessment data to plan; other data points used in the assessment described and are tied to program need*
 - *P: Plan to use data for ongoing improvement; clear schedule to report out on data to various stakeholders—staff= monthly, advisory board-4X, students and parents = X3*

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

IV. Budget Proposal

- 1. Budget Narrative*
- 2. Budget Forms*
- 3. Capacity for Success & Sustainability*

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: RSU 24 and Maine Seacoast Mission
DATE: 5/19/24
EVALUATOR NAME: Jessie Francis
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

- Budget Narrative
 - **P:** Includes cost per RLP- \$2395 per 76 RLP
 - **P:** Fee structure described—sliding scale, one-time registration fees ; scholarships provided if families cannot pay these fees
- Budget Forms:
 - **P:** Significant in-kind contributions from various partners
 - **Q:** \$40,645.80 of DOE 21st CCLC grant funds also supporting the program; it is not clear where these funds are from and not described in the budget narrative
 - **P:** District exceeds 35% transportation match requirement
 - **P:** Very detailed line items in budget
- *Capacity for Success & Sustainability*
 - **P:** Advisory board includes a number of district representatives as well as parents, students, and community members
 - **P:** Sustainability section describes lessons learned from previous 21stCCLC programming, plans to build additional relationships, and seek additional funding.

Priority Points

1. *Poverty Level*
2. *ESEA Accountability Status*
3. *Other Need*

limited out-of-school-time opportunities, high poverty, academic data, high food insecurity

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: RSU 24
DATE: May 18, 2024
EVALUATOR NAME: Luba Greene
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Instructions: The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by **individual** evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is **required** that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department's RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Appendix A – Proposal Cover Page

- Renewal

Appendix B – Debarment, Performance, and Non-Collusion Certification

- No notes here

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

- I. General Information
 - a. Abstract
 - b. Program Demographics
 - c. Partners

- Abstract - provides Before, After, & Summer programming; 62% of total students are LP;
- Program Demographics - 2 schools @ K-5; reasonable # of parents to be served
- Partners - Listed 8 community and school department partners;

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

- II. Specifications of Work to be Performed
 1. Planning
 2. Need for Program
 3. Program Design
 4. Program Management
 5. Program Evaluation

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: RSU 24
DATE: May 18, 2024
EVALUATOR NAME: Luba Greene
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

- Planning - 21st Century Director was a constant in the planning process; detailed list of many meetings over a very short time; included several stakeholders; most meetings were .5 hours in length
- Need for Program - 9 rural towns over a vast geographical area; need evidenced by community poverty rate average 15.6%, some towns at 20%; both schools Title 1 school-wide; 60-66% students not proficient in math and/or literacy; no other practical / accessible options for after-school care - YMCA is a 27 mile commute and fees make it unaffordable to many; no community transportation available; food insecurity; continue to offer parenting education and intergenerational events; Adult Education collaboration
- Program Design - (*Interesting - collaborations w/Maine Seacoast Mission & Title I - Summer Academy, Summer Academy Camp, recreational camps, vacation camps, - to heighten intellectual curiosity);
(? Would like to hear more about the multi-pronged approach to attract students & families & maintain attendance)
Linkages - (*Positive: RSU24 committing over \$14,000 yearly in Title 1 for tutoring support);
Instructional Leadership - Director is a Certified Teacher w/ grant management experience; other staff also trained educators, ed techs, or other related experience; monthly calendars
Safe/Appropriate - Common staff expectations for PD (First Aid, CPR, Responsive Classroom, de-escalation strategies); PQA will assess the space yearly
Student-Driven - (*Interesting - "Mini-courses") Gave several examples for student involvement into programming, but not many detailed examples
Regular Attendees: Process sounds built in already and past success in exceeding the RLP's minimum expectations by as much as 12.5%
- Program Management
Program Leadership - Director w/Maine Teaching Certification & w/17 years 21st CCLC experience; supervised by Curriculum Coordinator & part of Leadership Team meetings
School Leadership - Program staffed with school day teachers; constant communication from site leaders to school day teachers & admin. Admin Team supports program with hiring, promoting programs, space & PD, & on the Advisory Board
Staff & PD - Staff orientation process includes program goals, policies, celebrating successes; regular meetings; Director provides 6 PD trainings;

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: RSU 24
DATE: May 18, 2024
EVALUATOR NAME: Luba Greene
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Program Staff attend RSU24 in-service trainings & receive coaching; reciprocal training opportunities & monthly collaboration opportunities for learning plan support

Communication - variety of methods described; attending staff meetings; school district website spot; calls home for student progress;

Transportation - home and summer to and from school; Bus drivers receive training; review safety with students daily

Volunteers - University of Maine federal work-study program students; high school for service learning hours; volunteers are screened, receive orientation, PD, provide enrichment and help with fundraising

- Program Evaluation - use of regular local and state assessment data to drive programming; HQTeachers develop tutoring plans; use of research-based interventions that provide data such as Lexia/Moby Max online learning; use of teacher surveys, Physical Education assessments and 40 Developmental Assets surveys to identify at-risk students; participation data; family engagement attendance; board meetings & amount raised; describes well how often data will be used and with what groups, different methods .

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

III. Budget Proposal

1. Budget Narrative
2. Budget Forms
3. Capacity for Success & Sustainability

- Budget Narrative - 50% of transportation costs by RSU24; Title I budget providing for Tutors; One-time Registration Fees charged on a sliding-scale, multi-student family discounts, and scholarships available (Fees to contribute to fundraising goal of \$8,000); Partners contributing \$26,600 in various ways
- Budget Forms - Great detailed list of in-kind donations; Program Income: is that a carryover? Is the Director also overseeing other programs? Contracted Services - EdGE Summer Camp & Additional Vacation Camp Scholarships? It's unclear what they are and for how many students - is it onsite or off site? Seems high.
- Capacity for Success & Sustainability
Advisory Board is heavy with RSU24, would like to see more parents / community involvement in the member list
Recognizes the need for continued collaboration as well as expanding with new affiliations for sustainability; seeking to use the uniqueness of each community to drive programming and partnerships; MOA style of description for roles &

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: RSU 24
DATE: May 18, 2024
EVALUATOR NAME: Luba Greene
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

commitments of key partners; plan to seek more financial sponsorship from community partners

Priority Points

1. Poverty Level
2. ESEA Accountability Status
3. Other Need

- Poverty Level - Ella Lewis School at 52% F&R Lunch; Peninsula School is at 39% F&R Lunch
- ESEA Accountability Status
- Other Need - community poverty rate average 15.6%, some towns at 20%; both schools Title 1 school-wide; 60-66% students not proficient in math and/or literacy; no other practical / accessible options for after-school care - YMCA is a 27 mile commute and fees make it unaffordable to many; no community transportation available; food insecurity;

Appendix D:

Great details for Health and Wellness, Nutrition, STEM, & Safety Education activities; (*Interesting - weekly Schoodic Arts Club and Thester Clubs; collaboration with Adult Education for discounted courses for parents/caregivers; Intergenerational events; collaboration with UMaine Extension for parenting classes/informational events)

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: RSU 24 (Maine Seacoast Mission)
DATE: 5/22/24
EVALUATOR NAME: RACHELLE TOME
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Instructions: *The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by **individual** evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is **required** that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department's RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.*

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Appendix A – Proposal Cover Page

- P: Renewal-1 > 40%; 1-39% FRL
- I: \$182,000

Appendix B – Debarment, Performance, and Non-Collusion Certification

- P: Signed

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

- I. *General Information*
 - a. *Abstract*
 - b. *Program Demographics*
 - c. *Partners*

- P: Established program adding new partnerships.
- I: Total served 110; RLP 76, Cost per \$2394.73
- P: Partners include Healthy Acadia, DARE, Good Shepherd Food Bank

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

- II. *Specifications of Work to be Performed*
 1. *Planning*
 2. *Need for Program*
 3. *Program Design*
 4. *Program Management*
 5. *Program Evaluation*

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: RSU 24 (Maine Seacoast Mission)
DATE: 5/22/24
EVALUATOR NAME: RACHELLE TOME
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

- 1a. Initial exploration to determine plausibility.
- 1a. P: Meetings with multiple partners, surveys for feedback
- 1b. P: Meetings Nov 2023-Mar 2024 15+ hours
- 1b. P: 21st Director with a variety of groups
- 2.P: Several needs are identified, including academic (66% not proficient), socio-emotional health, transportation (27 miles to YMCA), finances (15.6% avg. poverty) and food insecurity.
- 3.1a. Academic support and enrichment, STEM, health and wellness, VPA. Hands-on approach.
- 3.1a. Summer collaboration with Maine Seacoast Mission and Title I. Remediation sessions during vacations.
- 3.1b. I: 2 sites; K-5
- 3.1b. Previous years data shows decrease due to district restructuring.
- 3.1c. Program hours exceed required minimums, student to staff ratios reasonable- adjusted for tutoring needs.
- 3.2a. Shared goals, staff and policies. PBL, coordinated between 21st and school day staff. Program staff are school staff.
- 3.2a. Shared PD and trainings.
- 3.2b. Director-certified teacher, grant management experience. Certified staff, ed techs, HQT tutors. Scheduled planning for individual learning plans.
- 3.2c Developmental Assets, Responsive Classroom, SAYO and PBIS. Increased intervention support.
- 3.2d. Student centered. Hands-on. Centers, mini courses, projects. Responsive classroom. Differentiated instruction.
- 3.2e. Participation by invitation. Collaboration, communication with parents. Attendance contests. Plan for communication if attendance decreases.
- 3.3 Expectations for % of overall academic improvement for math/ literacy appear ambitious.
- 3.3 Frequent opportunities to participate in selection of physical activity options.
- 3.3 Collaboration with Hancock County PD for DARE
- 3.3 Reasonable parent involvement opportunities including involvement in the Advisory Board.
- 3.4a. Qualifications for director (BA/BS) for leadership, expecting an understanding of areas that are crucial to program success. Ability to analyze programs and services. Current director is HQT, certified, 17 years of experience.

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: RSU 24 (Maine Seacoast Mission)
DATE: 5/22/24
EVALUATOR NAME: RACHELLE TOME
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

- 3.4b. Regular meetings between director and district admin. Communication/coordination with site leaders and school staff.
- 3.4c. Week long orientation for staff. PD on Developmental Assets, PQA, PBIS, academic areas. Will attend RSU 24 in-service offerings and will have a peer coach.
- 3.4d. Site leaders attend staff meetings. Various methods for disseminating program information to stakeholders. Various means of communicating with parents, including phone calls.
- 3.4e. Transportation available for afterschool home and during the summer.
- 3.4f. Volunteers recruited from local university students and high school students and a variety of community organizations.
- 3.5a. Established performance baselines from NWEA and other objective data sources. Cycle outlined and aligned to goals.
- 3.5b. Fall/spring assessments, input via surveys and a variety of other assessment sources. Student/parent feedback and data will determine program success.
- 3.5c. Various data sources compiled and analyzed. Results shared at specific interval outlined for specific groups of stakeholders.

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

III. Budget Proposal

- 1. Budget Narrative*
- 2. Budget Forms*
- 3. Capacity for Success & Sustainability*

- 1a. Estimated per pupil \$2395. (Actual is \$2294.73)
- 1c. Sliding scale for registration. Scholarships available.
- 1d. Use of Title I, local contributions.
- 1e. Purpose is outlined.
- 1f. In-kind funding from RSU 24, Seacoast Mission and various other partners.
- 2. (002) DOE 21st CCLC funding. Source?
- 2. (002) Registration fees \$3000. Narrative says \$8000 and includes fund raising.
- 2. (005) 53.5% transportation costs covered by district
- 3a. Varied membership on advisory board, including parents and students.

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: RSU 24 (Maine Seacoast Mission)
DATE: 5/22/24
EVALUATOR NAME: RACHELLE TOME
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

- 3b. Successful implementation of prior 21st CCLC grants. Attention to continuing partnerships while inviting new affiliations. Fundraising committee to explore new options. Investigation of community partners. Pooling resources.
- 3c. Consistent involvement of key partners

Priority Points

1. *Poverty Level*
2. *ESEA Accountability Status*
3. *Other Need*

- Lack of after school care.
- Distance form other options (YMCA 27 miles)
- Economic disadvantage. 15.6%
- Food insecurity.
- 66% Not proficient in math/ literacy

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: RSU 54 and KVCAP
DATE: 4/29/24
EVALUATOR NAME: Jessie Francis
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Instructions: *The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by **individual** evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is **required** that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department's RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.*

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Appendix A – Proposal Cover Page

- Pass

Appendix B – Debarment, Performance, and Non-Collusion Certification

- Pass

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

- I. *General Information*
 - a. *Abstract*
 - b. *Program Demographics*
 - c. *Partners*

- a) *Abstract*
 - a.
- b) *Program Demographics*
 - a. **P:** *High percentage of students to be served are RLPs (87%)*
- c) *Partners*
 - a. **P:** *Multiple and varied partners listed*

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

- II. *Specifications of Work to be Performed*
 1. *Planning*
 2. *Need for Program*
 3. *Program Design*

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: RSU 54 and KVCAP
DATE: 4/29/24
EVALUATOR NAME: Jessie Francis
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

- | |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">4. <i>Program Management</i>5. <i>Program Evaluation</i> |
|---|

- *Planning*
 - *P: Evidence of long planning period*
 - *P: Planning meeting include various partners*
- *Need for Program*
 - *P: Describes need for program with various data points (loss of jobs in area, rates of child abuse and neglect increasing, poverty, single-parent households, use of cannabis, ACEs, other health factors, academic scores).*
- *Program Design*
 - *Q: Use of acronyms in application required me to guess what things meant (e.g., ASP, PD, SC).*
 - *P: student selection based on assessment data*
 - *P: project-based curriculum with STEM and multi-cultural components and varied by age/grade level to ensure developmentally appropriate.*
 - *P: Appropriate staff to student ratio, very low ratio at Bloomfield Elementary School in school year (1:6)*
 - *P: Describes tangible links to school day*
 - *P: Safety describes physical and emotional safety, integration of trauma-informed care*
 - *P: Describes student choice and involvement including a student on the advisory board*
 - *P: includes tangible plan to promote attendance (parent phone call after 2 days absent)*
 - *P: Goals include specific types of activities and strategies proposed and link to the program design section*
- *Program Management*
 - *P: specific skill set and qualifications described for PD*
 - *P: Describes communication of impact on program and regular communication with families*
 - *P: Existing relationships with organizations to support volunteer s*
- *Program Evaluation*
 - *P: Shares past parent survey information, intends to continue surveying parents*

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: RSU 54 and KVCAP
DATE: 4/29/24
EVALUATOR NAME: Jessie Francis
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

- **P:** Describes other data to be used in evaluation and to develop an improvement plan and how that info will be disseminated through “local impact statements”

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

III. Budget Proposal

- 1. Budget Narrative*
- 2. Budget Forms*
- 3. Capacity for Success & Sustainability*

- 1. Budget Narrative*
 - a. I: Low cost per RLP (\$1166)*
 - b. P: Detailed and cohesive budget narrative*
- 2. Budget Forms*
 - a. P: Significant in-kind support and significant # of partners providing in-kind support.*
 - b. P: Braiding in CACFP funding for food*
 - c. P: Other state and federal grants supporting programming (Maine Outdoor Learning Initiatives)*
 - d. I: High school staff being used and paid. This seems like a good way to foster community, keep older kids engaged.*
 - e. P: District providing 35% of transportation costs*
 - f. P: Majority of costs going to salaries*
- 3. Capacity for Success & Sustainability*
 - a. P: Various members on the advisory board including a student ambassador on the advisory board*
 - b. I: The afterschool program is a part of a “birth through grade 5 community school model”*
 - c. P: Describes specific ways in which they’ll seek future funding (becoming a licensed childcare provider to allow for subsidies, seek grants and corporate sponsorships)*

Priority Points

- 1. Poverty Level*
- 2. ESEA Accountability Status*
- 3. Other Need*

Coming from Maine DOE

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: RSU 54 and KVCAP
DATE: 4/29/24
EVALUATOR NAME: Jessie Francis
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

- *loss of jobs in area, rates of child abuse and neglect increasing, poverty, single-parent households*

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: RSU 54
DATE: April 20, 2024
EVALUATOR NAME: Luba Greene
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Instructions: *The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by **individual** evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is **required** that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department's RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.*

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Appendix A – Proposal Cover Page

- Renewal

Appendix B – Debarment, Performance, and Non-Collusion Certification

- no notes

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

I. General Information

- a. Abstract*
- b. Program Demographics*
- c. Partners*

- a. Abstract
- b. Program Demographics: 3 schools (sites): K-2, 3-5, 6-8;
?Attainable - numbers of RLP students and # of parents to be served
- c. Partners
*Positives: strong list of partners, 30+ partners

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

II. Specifications of Work to be Performed

- 1. Planning*
- 2. Need for Program*

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: RSU 54
DATE: April 20, 2024
EVALUATOR NAME: Luba Greene
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

- 3. *Program Design*
- 4. *Program Management*
- 5. *Program Evaluation*

1. Planning:
*Positives: significant planning, 102.5 hours in meetings; involved some restructuring in lead partnership, comprehensive and detailed planning
2. Need for Program
*High poverty rate; high numbers of students who Do Not Meet on NWEAs; community economically struggling with significant job losses
3. Program Design
*Positives: High-quality Experiential learning with many community partners; Student Ambassadors; Leaders-in-Training; made a change in programming to choice club-based that doubled past attendance; linkages - staff Professional Development includes family strengthening and trauma-informed practices; Alternative education activities & calm-down space “to keep connected to the learning”; great high visibility ideas; included theater; great list of activities in Health & Wellness goal

*Interesting: Gr.K-1 “Integrated literacy & STEM activities into guided play-to-learn labs”; Social Worker/Counselor on Advisory Board; Field Trips as incentives for 30-day attendance; Student-Run International Food Festival; shopping trips for healthy foods with a budget; Parent education ideas - Family Guidebook, book studies, guest speakers;
4. Program Management:
*Positives: plan for next school day follow-up for behavioral concerns; Staff required to fulfill the Maine Roads to Quality Youth Development credentials; again notable list of community volunteers
5. Program Evaluation
*Positives: evaluations are varied and regularly scheduled; programs are included in school district’s newsletter reaching 14,000 residents

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

III. Budget Proposal

1. *Budget Narrative*
2. *Budget Forms*
3. *Capacity for Success & Sustainability*

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: RSU 54
DATE: April 20, 2024
EVALUATOR NAME: Luba Greene
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

1. Budget Narrative:
 - *Positives: low cost per pupil; anticipates \$370,000 in in-kind donations; includes local restaurant providing food for family events; seeking other grant funding
 - *Interesting: MOLI (Maine Outdoor Learning Initiative) providing enrichment as well as professional development for afterschool staff for outdoor education
2. Budget Forms
3. Capacity for Success & Sustainability
 - *Positives: 30+ partners involved in planning, enrichment, sustainability; joining the Community School Coalition; included a detailed 4-year plan; Year 2 = becoming licensed providers; school district increasingly budgeting amount for Program Director's salary
 - *Interesting: partners are invited to all family dinners, engagement, & educational events

Priority Points

1. *Poverty Level*
2. *ESEA Accountability Status*
3. *Other Need*

1. Poverty Level: All 3 schools are 66% Free & Reduced Lunch

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: RSU 54 (KVCAP)
DATE: 4/28/24
EVALUATOR NAME: RACHELLE TOME
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Instructions: *The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by **individual** evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is **required** that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department's RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.*

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Appendix A – Proposal Cover Page

- P: Renewal- 3 at 66% FRL

Appendix B – Debarment, Performance, and Non-Collusion Certification

- P: Signed

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

- I. General Information*
- a. Abstract*
 - b. Program Demographics*
 - c. Partners*

- P: Indicates collaboration with KVCAP and multiple community partners.
- P: School year and summer
- P: Three schools served
- P: 87% of students served annually are RLP
- P: Diverse partners, including Big Brothers, Big Sisters, Maine Afterschool Network and Thomas College

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

- II. Specifications of Work to be Performed*
- 1. Planning*
 - 2. Need for Program*
 - 3. Program Design*

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: RSU 54 (KVCAP)
DATE: 4/28/24
EVALUATOR NAME: RACHELLE TOME
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

<i>4. Program Management</i> <i>5. Program Evaluation</i>
--

- 1. P: Over 100 hours for planning and conversations with a wide variety of stakeholders, including parents and students
- 1. P: Meeting list is detailed and comprehensive
- 2. P: Needs outlined, including poverty and MIYHS data regarding cannabis use, bullying and suicidal thoughts. High incidence of substance abuse in the area; 1:3 students have experience 4 or more ACEs
- 3. P: Small group instruction, experiential and project-based learning
- 3. P: Wide range of topics, with consideration for age groups. Includes STEM, literacy, risk prevention.
- 3. P: Steps taken to increase participation after COVID, including improved communication with parents, additional bus stops and attendance incentives.
- 3. P: Staffing ratios adjusted for age level and type of activity
- 3. P: Multiple strategies listed for linking and coordination, including combined training with district and quarterly meetings. PD and SC invited to school student meetings as needed.
- 3. P: Appropriate safety measures in place, including trauma informed and social emotional approaches
- 3. P: Experiential learning model with student informed focus
- 3. P: Transportation provided. Social media for communication, small student to staff ratios, student voice/choice in planning
- 4. P: Leadership qualification acceptable and include proficiency with using data and communication
- 4. P: Regular advisory board meetings, daily coordination between PD and SC.
- 4. I: Staff required to register for YPQA certification.
- 4. P: Multiple data sources used to determine PD effectiveness.
- 4. P: Annual local impact statement from PD. Multiple sources/options listed for dissemination.
- 4. P: Shuttle busses provided for inter-school transport. Cost support from RSU 54 is 35%
- 4. P: Current volunteers represent a continuum of skills. College students are invited.
- 4. I: Volunteers from New Balance create a partnership.
- 5. P: Survey results from parents indicate level of need.

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: RSU 54 (KVCAP)
DATE: 4/28/24
EVALUATOR NAME: RACHELLE TOME
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

- 5. P: Multiple data sources cited to facilitate program review
- 5. P: Periodic evaluation process includes review of state/local assessment data-fall to spring. Coordination with district to determine individual needs
- 5. P: Multiple data sources listed for periodic review by PD, SC and staff. Data driven improvement strategies include sharing results and feedback from stakeholders.

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

III. Budget Proposal

- 1. Budget Narrative*
- 2. Budget Forms*
- 3. Capacity for Success & Sustainability*

- 1. P: Budget narrative addresses required components.
- 1. P: In-Kind and district sources cover over 50% of costs.
- 1. Q: Federal or State funds, such as Title I, IDEA, CTE referenced.
- 1. P: Multiple resources to support sustainability identified
- 2: P: High % of in-kind services
- 2. P: 35% transportation costs covered by RSU 54
- 3. P: Parents and students ambassador listed on the advisory board
- 3. P: Comprehensive planning for sustainability outlined. Strategies listed include building relationships and coordination with several community partners
- 3. P: Consistent involvement of key partners

Priority Points

- 1. Poverty Level*
- 2. ESEA Accountability Status*
- 3. Other Need*

- High % of FLR- 64%
- MIYHS indicates cannabis use, bullying and suicidal thoughts
- Substance abuse in the region
- 1:3 students experience 4 or more ACEs

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: RSU 67 and Lincoln Recreation Department
DATE: 5/20/24
EVALUATOR NAME: Jessie Francis
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Instructions: *The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by **individual** evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is **required** that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department's RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.*

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Appendix A – Proposal Cover Page

- Pass

Appendix B – Debarment, Performance, and Non-Collusion Certification

- Pass

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

- I. *General Information*
 - a. *Abstract*
 - b. *Program Demographics*
 - c. *Partners*

- II. *Pass*
 - a. **Q:** *Indicates 93 RLPs to be served annually in section b and then 90 in Section 1.b.*

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

- III. *Specifications of Work to be Performed*
 1. *Planning*
 2. *Need for Program*
 3. *Program Design*
 4. *Program Management*
 5. *Program Evaluation*

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: RSU 67 and Lincoln Recreation Department
DATE: 5/20/24
EVALUATOR NAME: Jessie Francis
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

- *Planning*
 - **Q:** *Very short planning period (2 months) and very limited hours spent on planning (7 hours)*
Q: *Planning section does not describe in-depth planning process and does not use punctuation.*
- *Need for Program*
 - **Q:** *No data our sources sited to describe community need*
 - **P:** *suggested needs based on: limited child care, availability of support from local recreation department*
 - **N:** *No academic data presented.*
 - **P:** *Section does describe how program will meet needs presented.*
- *Program Design*
 - **N:** *Only math programming is described in the program description section yet the goal section speaks to a broader range of activities. This section would have benefited from describing more around the types of activities that students would have access to and how the program is designed around those.*
 - **P:** *Meets minimum hour and ratio requirements; exceeds recreation ratios*
 - **P:** *Sharing of assessment data and student goals between school and afterschool*
 - **I:** *Prioritizing students who are of higher need through “invitation model” Unclear how this will work to ensure students attend consistently, but I appreciate the reach to students most in need.*
 - **Goals**
 - **I:** *Very rigorous academic goals proposed; unable to tell if these are realistic because of limited data provided elsewhere in the application.*
 - **I:** *One proposed outcome is “60% improved attitudes” will be measured through survey.*
- *Program Management*
 - **P:** *Describes the preferences for qualifications and background of a program leader; this person will be a part of the district admin team*
 - **P:** *Staff will be surveyed to understand their PD needs; offerings will be tailored*
 - **N:** *I would have preferred some examples or priorities of PD staff in this section*
 - **P:** *Background checks provided for volunteers; volunteers will not be counted in staff ratios*

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: RSU 67 and Lincoln Recreation Department
DATE: 5/20/24
EVALUATOR NAME: Jessie Francis
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

- *Program Evaluation*
 - **P:** Use of NWEA academic data from student participations pre, mid-, and post- attendance
 - **P:** Self-assessments will prompt action plans to address needs
 - **P:** results of periodic evaluation shared at board meetings
 - **Q:** Exact timeline and plan for these evaluations is not very clear; more detail and data could be useful in this section.

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

IV. Budget Proposal

- 1. Budget Narrative*
- 2. Budget Forms*
- 3. Capacity for Success & Sustainability*

- Budget Narrative
 - **P:** Provides estimated cost per RLP
 - (using 93 students; this # not provided in narrative)
 - **P:** Indicates no fees will be charged
 - **P:** Describes use of other funds in the budget narrative in a clear way
- Budget Forms:
 - **I:** Doesn't list district contributions as "in-kind" instead lists it as "state and municipal funding"; thanks to detail in budget narrative this can be understood, but would have been clearer on Form 001 as in-kind
 - **P:** District exceeding 35% transportation match
 - **P:** High wages paid to staff match with high qualification expectations described in the application. I also appreciate ensuring staff are paid a reasonable and livable wage.
 - **Q:** There is a significant amount of the grant request in the supply line; some of these items (e.g., computers) should have likely been classified as equipment.
 - There are some additional details in the budget narrative on actual costs of the supplies on these lines.
 - **N:** It strikes me as odd to put include \$30,900 in the budget for curriculum that is not described or justified anywhere else in the application
 - **Q:** Admin line has a description but no dollar amount
 - **Q:** occupancy expense not included; elsewhere in the application the bidder describes the district providing the school space

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: RSU 67 and Lincoln Recreation Department
DATE: 5/20/24
EVALUATOR NAME: Jessie Francis
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

- *Capacity for Success & Sustainability*
 - **Q:** Small advisory board with two individuals who are not yet determined
 - **P:** Some specific opportunities for raising funds are described
 - **N:** Very few details are provided in this section; difficult to evaluate the program's ability to succeed in the future based on the limited response provided.

Priority Points

1. *Poverty Level*
2. *ESEA Accountability Status*
3. *Other Need*

limited child care

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: RSU 67
DATE: May 17, 2024
EVALUATOR NAME: Luba Greene
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Instructions: *The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by **individual** evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is **required** that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department's RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.*

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Appendix A – Proposal Cover Page

- New Proposal

Appendix B – Debarment, Performance, and Non-Collusion Certification

-

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

- I. *General Information*
 - a. *Abstract*
 - b. *Program Demographics*
 - c. *Partners*

- *Abstract - RSU67 and Lincoln Rec. Department have worked together in the past to combine resources; this grant will enable that to grow to engage more students in meaningful life-skills activities*
- *Program Demographics - (*accurate? check #s of students in schools) Number of parents to be served seems high / unattainable*
- *Partners - Lead Partner: Lincoln Recreation Department*

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

- II. *Specifications of Work to be Performed*
 1. *Planning*
 2. *Need for Program*
 3. *Program Design*

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: RSU 67
DATE: May 17, 2024
EVALUATOR NAME: Luba Greene
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

<p>4. <i>Program Management</i> 5. <i>Program Evaluation</i></p>
--

- *Planning - limited planning timeline - only 3 meeting dates listed, did not include grant writing sessions nor titles/roles of Participants*
- *Need for Program - discussed a review of community needs to include after school during work hours; there is no recreation department facility; no data here to support need; no academic data provided;*
- *Program Design - the response mostly gave Mathematics examples; would like to have read more about other academic or SEL areas for programming; (*Interesting / Positive - sending home activities such as games aligned with the program's curriculum, fostering connection between home and school)
School Day Linkages - sharing NWEA & intervention data; weak answer overall
Instructional Leadership - certified teachers when possible; paraprofessionals
Safe & Appropriate - Staff CHRC & receive mandatory training on child protection protocols, emergency procedures; will establish protocols for reporting / addressing concerns; Zones of Regulation training
Student-Driven - daily schedule enables students to start with academics or with recreational activities, depending on the student's needs that day
Regular Attendees - targeting through invitation; open slots filled with other students as schedule is able to accommodate & based on family needs; MTSS process to identify students; teacher recommendations*
- *Program Management
Program Leadership - Will advertise for Director w/preference given to someone w/ assistant principal or building principal certification; (*Question - is the Director also a Site Coordinator?)
School Leadership - director will be part of the District's Administrative Team & work with Curriculum Director with data & goal setting
Staff & PD - Would like to see this more concrete - such as staff have some common required trainings and then some that are more individualized; staff receive 6 hours annually
Communication - Space on District's website for programs; flyers; presentations at school board meetings that are televised
Transportation - from site to home; no mention of Summer Program transportation in this section*

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: RSU 67
DATE: May 17, 2024
EVALUATOR NAME: Luba Greene
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Volunteers - Use of district's volunteer form and background check process; advertise in newspaper for volunteers; use Recreation Department student staff to volunteer for community service hours / mentoring to students

- *Program Evaluation - would like to see more concrete examples of data being collected; this whole section is weak - answers are short and example would have been helpful*

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

III. Budget Proposal

1. Budget Narrative
2. Budget Forms
3. Capacity for Success & Sustainability

- *Budget Narrative - cost per RLP is \$2688, No Fees; this is a new program with 2 sites, many costs in the first year will not be incurred in the next years such as computers, STEM kits); (*? Cost for Computer for Director and Coordinator \$12,300 seems excessive and only \$3500 for Computers/Devices for kids)*
- *Budget Forms - (*Negative - there are no in-kind donations listed)
Personnel - Director only works 36 weeks?)
Under All Other - (*Question - Line15. Administration - there is a description of time to be allocated, but nothing under the budget columns)*
- *Capacity for Success & Sustainability (*Negative - only 4 Advisory Board members); Plan - not much detail here; Program Director position would slowly shift to part-time or less with streamlining of systems and data collection; Board explore possible fee structure after the 4 years; Mentioned 2 possible grants.
Minimal answers in this section.
Key Partners - Minimal answer, but describes the key partners' roles / MOA style*

Priority Points

1. Poverty Level
2. ESEA Accountability Status
3. Other Need

- *Poverty Level - F&R Lunch at 43% & 44%*
- *ESEA Accountability Status*
- *Other Need - region has limited childcare facilities for working families, an increase in drug use, no community recreation building*

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: RSU 67
DATE: May 17, 2024
EVALUATOR NAME: Luba Greene
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Appendix D:

Would like to have read more concrete examples in the strategies and activities. Goals for academic improvement seem high; (*Positive - service learning / community service activities that are student-driven; VPA activities include a showcase for families); Sustainability ideas include exploring local businesses and 2 grant opportunities.

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: RSU 67 (Lincoln Recreation Department)
DATE: 5/20/24
EVALUATOR NAME: RACHELLE TOME
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Instructions: *The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by **individual** evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is **required** that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department's RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.*

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Appendix A – Proposal Cover Page

- P: New proposal-2> 40% FRL
- I: \$250,000

Appendix B – Debarment, Performance, and Non-Collusion Certification

- P: Signed

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

- I. General Information*
- a. Abstract*
 - b. Program Demographics*
 - c. Partners*

- P: Includes parenting resources, limited childcare, increased drug use
- I: Total served 93; RLP 93, Cost per \$2688.17
- Q: 100% served in both schools?
- Q: Lincoln Rec-sole partner

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

- II. Specifications of Work to be Performed*
- 1. Planning*
 - 2. Need for Program*
 - 3. Program Design*
 - 4. Program Management*

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: RSU 67 (Lincoln Recreation Department)
DATE: 5/20/24
EVALUATOR NAME: RACHELLE TOME
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

5. Program Evaluation

- 1a. Minimal planning
- 1b. N: 3 Meetings Feb 2024-Mar 2024 7 hours
- 2: Informal reviews, student/ family feedback
- 2. Need for activities to provide childcare appear to be the priority, with some academic supports
- 3.1a. Program focuses on mathematics and real-life applications.
- 3.1b. 2 afterschool sites spanning K-6; 100% to be served
- 3.1b. Family engagement days with take-home activities. Retentions strategies to encourage regular attendance. Math/ literacy games.
- 3.1c/d. Required minimums for daily hours and student to teacher ratios.
- 3.2a. Communication with school staff. Use of NWEA and teacher input to inform tutoring.
- 3.2b. Intent is to hire certified staff or paraprofessionals.
- 3.2c Mandatory trainings. Clear and enforced rules with communication procedures. Zones of Regulation and conflict resolution training
- 3.2d. Schedule set with student input. Activities designed to meet needs.
- 3.2e. Attendance appears variable, by invitation and based on needs and priorities. No additional details provided.

- 3.3 very high expectations for % of overall academic improvement for math/ literacy.
- 3.3 Engagement in STEM, VPA once monthly
- 3.3 Reasonable parent involvement opportunities suggested.
- 3.4a. Director currently not in place. Qualifications for director set at certified asst. prin. level. Expectations for data experience, communication, leadership skills
- 3.4b. District curriculum will coordinate with program director. Director will be considered district administrator.
- 3.4c. An explicit plan for PD is not present. Needs are determined by staff surveys. Observations by director will inform additional supports.
- 3.4d. Website information, flyers. Updates at Board meetings.
- 3.4e. Site to home. No information specific to summer.
- 3.4f. Use of current volunteers and possibly student volunteers form the Rec program.

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: RSU 67 (Lincoln Recreation Department)
DATE: 5/20/24
EVALUATOR NAME: RACHELLE TOME
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

- 3.5a. NWEA data, mid-year end of year. Coordination with school to determine progress.
- 3.5b. Self-assessments through surveys at regular intervals. Attendance, intervention, academic data to determine effectiveness.
- 3.5c. Results shared at Board meetings.

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

III. Budget Proposal

- 1. Budget Narrative*
- 2. Budget Forms*
- 3. Capacity for Success & Sustainability*

- 1a. Per pupil \$2688.17
- 1b. Great statement on commitment.
- 1c. No fees
- 1d. Several options for funding transportation cited.
- 1e. Purpose is very general, for staff costs.
- 1f. Several financial sources listed.
- 2. (001) No In-kind \$ listed
- 2. (003) Q: Salary differences; Director \$45. P/h Some staff \$45, some \$25.
- 2. (005) Q. High supply costs
- 2. (005) 35% transportation costs covered by district- requirement not met. 60% covered by 21st CCLC.
- 3a. Advisory Board not in place, 2/4 members still pending.
- 3b. Strategies listed to explore options for sustainability.
- 3c. Involvement of key partners outlined

Priority Points

- 1. Poverty Level*
- 2. ESEA Accountability Status*
- 3. Other Need*

- Need or childcare.
- Suggestion of increased drug use-no specific data

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: RSU 85/MSAD 19 and Lubec Community Center
DATE: 4/30/24
EVALUATOR NAME: Jessie Francis
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Instructions: *The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by **individual** evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is **required** that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department's RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.*

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Appendix A – Proposal Cover Page

- Pass

Appendix B – Debarment, Performance, and Non-Collusion Certification

- Pass

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

I. General Information

- a. Abstract*
- b. Program Demographics*
- c. Partners*

II. Abstract

- a. I: Environmental focus STEM curriculum (focus on food)*

III. Program Demographics

- a. P: 100% of students served to be RLPs*

IV. Partners

- a. N: No additional partners listed in this section, but mentioned through the grant application under volunteers and in the budget.*

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

V. Specifications of Work to be Performed

- 1. Planning*
- 2. Need for Program*

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: RSU 85/MSAD 19 and Lubec Community Center
DATE: 4/30/24
EVALUATOR NAME: Jessie Francis
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

- | |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">3. <i>Program Design</i>4. <i>Program Management</i>5. <i>Program Evaluation</i> |
|--|

- *Planning*
 - **Q:** *Short planning period (January -April) and only four documented meetings*
 - **P:** *Parent input in planning process*
- *Need for Program*
 - **P:** *Describes need for program (poverty rate, single-family homes, limited access to extra-curricular, limited access to transportation and internet)*
 - **I:** *Speaks to engaging families and providing them a space as well as students*
- *Program Design*
 - **P:** *Speaks to specific family needs in the area*
 - **P:** *integration with food pantry in the Community Center*
 - **P:** *Long summer days offered (7 hours per day)*
 - **P:** *low student ratios offered.*
 - **P:** *located on the same campus as the school*
 - **P:** *regular communication with school leaders (including school board)*
 - **P:** *licensed as a childcare center*
 - **Q:** *unclear if the program will be sliding scale or no fee at this point in the application.*
 - **Goals**
 - **I:** *% of students whose academic scores will improve seem very low*
 - **P:** *Significant nutrition programming ties in with STEM and horticulture supports described in abstract and the needs around poverty and food insecurity.*
- *Program Management*
 - **P:** *Description of skills and qualifications required of the program director*
 - **Q:** *program director scheduled at 30 hours per week with 10 hours for site management—not sure what this means?*
 - **P:** *PD for staff described; staff will have some choice in PD opportunities but focused around student needs*
 - **Q:** *Transportation not provided.*

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: RSU 85/MSAD 19 and Lubec Community Center
DATE: 4/30/24
EVALUATOR NAME: Jessie Francis
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

- **N:** Not a lot of information provided as to how volunteers will be vetted and trained
- *Program Evaluation*
 - **P:** Some of the types of data to be used in evaluation are described including input from students, parents, and teachers

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

VI. Budget Proposal

- 1. Budget Narrative*
- 2. Budget Forms*
- 3. Capacity for Success & Sustainability*

- Budget Narrative
 - **P:** No fee if grant awarded
- Budget Forms:
 - **Q:** Unclear from the budget narrative and forms whether all of the private funding grants are already in-hand.
 - **N:** 35% of student transportation not provided by the school district. \$750 for field trips charged to grant.
- *Capacity for Success & Sustainability*
 - **P:** Describes some specific ideas for obtaining additional funding and community support to sustain programming

Priority Points

- 1. Poverty Level*
- 2. ESEA Accountability Status*
- 3. Other Need*

Information coming from DOE

- High % of single-family households

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: RSU 85 MSAD 19
DATE: April 20, 2024
EVALUATOR NAME: Luba Greene
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Instructions: *The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by **individual** evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is **required** that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department's RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.*

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Appendix A – Proposal Cover Page

- New

Appendix B – Debarment, Performance, and Non-Collusion Certification

- no notes here

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

- I. General Information*
 - a. Abstract*
 - b. Program Demographics*
 - c. Partners*

- a. Abstract*
- b. Program Demographics: one school K-8*
- c. Partners: Lubec Community Outreach Center (LCOC)*

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

- II. Specifications of Work to be Performed*
 - 1. Planning*
 - 2. Need for Program*
 - 3. Program Design*
 - 4. Program Management*

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: RSU 85 MSAD 19
DATE: April 20, 2024
EVALUATOR NAME: Luba Greene
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

5. Program Evaluation

1. Planning
*Negative: only 4 planning meetings documented
2. Need for Program
*High community poverty at 26.26%
3. Program Design
*Positives: proximity of center to school for collaboration; center is already established / trusted within the community; weekly music programs; strategic thinking & decision making skills through board games/Chess; No fees structure; licensed childcare facility; community service projects
*Interesting: ready and scheduled access to children’s counselor; Horticulture / Composting & Water/Solar Power learning activities; dedicated Fabric & Fiber studio to learn weaving; Safety Education trainings for students; Learn from a Real Artist of the Month; Family Friday Nights & Family Garden & Grill events; Conducting personal invitation phone-a-thons; parent attendance incentives: Pop-up Food Pantry, Thrift Shop Free coupons
*Negative: doesn’t list a student advisory board; feels more student-centered and less student driven
4. Program Management:
*Positive: encourages staff growth with areas of choice for Professional Development; great list of volunteer partnership organizations; staff develops goals and required 10 hours of Professional Development;
*Negative: “a minimum of one certified teacher”; no mention of collaborating of Professional Development with the school
?Question: no transportation \$ except Summer field trips
5. Program Evaluation
*Positives: periodic evaluations to drive services & enrichment

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

III. Budget Proposal

1. *Budget Narrative*
2. *Budget Forms*
3. *Capacity for Success & Sustainability*

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: RSU 85 MSAD 19
DATE: April 20, 2024
EVALUATOR NAME: Luba Greene
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

1. Budget Narrative
2. Budget Forms
3. Capacity for Success & Sustainability:
 - *Positives: “this working relationship supports a child’s understanding that the whole community is working with them”; supported by town budget; LCOC has an established fund development plan with private funding from partners; identifying key funding streams; LCOC offers partners “reciprocal support” ex: events, volunteer opportunities)
 - *Interesting: Snack plus “late day take-away meal” offered; Publicly thank all partners
 - *?Question: is the fundraising goal achievable?
 - *Negative: low in-kind contributions

Priority Points

1. *Poverty Level*
2. *ESEA Accountability Status*
3. *Other Need*

- Enter your notes here

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: RSU 85 MSAD 19 (LCOC)
DATE: 4/16/24
EVALUATOR NAME: RACHELLE TOME
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Instructions: *The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by **individual** evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is **required** that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department's RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.*

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Appendix A – Proposal Cover Page

- P: New Proposal 1 > 64% FRL

Appendix B – Debarment, Performance, and Non-Collusion Certification

- P: Signed

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

- I. General Information*
- a. Abstract*
 - b. Program Demographics*
 - c. Partners*

- P: Indicates partnership with Lubec Consolidated Outreach Center.
- P: Program includes academics, including STEM and a variety of healthy living and recreation options
- P: School year and summer
- Q: 100% of students served are RLP.
- N: Single partner

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

- II. Specifications of Work to be Performed*
- 1. Planning*
 - 2. Need for Program*
 - 3. Program Design*

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: RSU 85 MSAD 19 (LCOC)
DATE: 4/16/24
EVALUATOR NAME: RACHELLE TOME
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

*4. Program Management
5. Program Evaluation*

- 1. P: Close geographic proximity between RSU 85 and LCOC
- 1. I: Planning took place over just under 3 months
- 1. P: Parents included in the planning process
- 2. N: Limited data, other than poverty rate.
- 2. I: Proposal lists single family homes, addiction, truancy and limited internet as factors
- 2. P: Proposal would eliminate current fees for LCOC
- 3. P: Academic support and activities in literacy, STEM (cooking, horticulture) and a variety of other options. Physical activity, outdoor enrichment included.
- 3. Q: 3 hours daily-SY; 7 hours daily-summer
- 3. P: LCOC in same building as LCS; daily coordination
- 3. Q: PD, min of 1 cert. teacher, volunteers; schedule and learning objective to be planned.
- 3. P: Safety measures are currently in place. LCOC is licensed for child care.
- 3. N: Limited student choice of activities, pending staffing
- 3. P: Daily schedules altered to benefit regular attendance; check-ins included
- 4. Q: PD also serves as SD
- 4. P: Assurance of coordination between school leadership and staff; access to relevant data
- 4. P: PD includes academic and SEL training, along with teacher choice
- 4. P: Multiple methods for communication noted
- 4. N: Transportation relies heavily on parental drop offs and pick up during summer programming and after school.
- 5. Q: Potential actions for developing the program are listed with limited explanations for how actions will be implemented.
- 5. N: Minimal steps for periodic evaluations. Quarterly using survey and qualitative data
- 5. Q: Periodic reviews from a variety of stakeholders noted. Results shared with Advisory committee; results posted online and distributed hardcopy
-

*Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget
III. Budget Proposal*

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: RSU 85 MSAD 19 (LCOC)
DATE: 4/16/24
EVALUATOR NAME: RACHELLE TOME
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

1. *Budget Narrative*
2. *Budget Forms*
3. *Capacity for Success & Sustainability*

- 1. P: Budget narrative addresses required components.
- 1. I: No indication of use Federal or State funds, Local and in kind only.
- 1. P: Fundraising plan noted for program sustainability
- 2: Q: Fringe benefits for staff not noted
- 2. Q: Total transportation costs (\$750) covered by 21st CCLC
- 3. P: Parents listed on the advisory board
- 3. P: 3–5-year planning window includes a variety of strategies to support sustainability, including internship opportunities and AmeriCorp grants.
- 3. P: Consistent involvement of key partners

Priority Points

1. *Poverty Level*
2. *ESEA Accountability Status*
3. *Other Need*

- High incidence of single-family homes
- Truancy
- Lack of broadband for internet access

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Westbrook Public Schools and ICC
DATE: 4/30/24
EVALUATOR NAME: Jessie Francis
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Instructions: *The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by **individual** evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is **required** that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department's RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.*

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Appendix A – Proposal Cover Page

- Pass

Appendix B – Debarment, Performance, and Non-Collusion Certification

- Pass

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

I. General Information

- a. Abstract*
- b. Program Demographics*
- c. Partners*

II. Abstract

- a. P: Only after school program serving middle schoolers in Westbrook*
- b. P: High population of multi-language learners in area and primary partner is Intercultural Community Center – MLLs served by afterschool = 42%*

III. Program Demographics

- a. P: Majority of students are RLPs, 97%*

IV. Partners

- a. N: Only one partner listed, later in the application relationships and in-kind provided by other partners.*

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

V. Specifications of Work to be Performed

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Westbrook Public Schools and ICC
DATE: 4/30/24
EVALUATOR NAME: Jessie Francis
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

1. *Planning*
2. *Need for Program*
3. *Program Design*
4. *Program Management*
5. *Program Evaluation*

- *Planning*
 - **Q:** *Short planning period (feb through April)*
 - **P:** *Many planning meetings held*
- *Need for Program*
 - **P:** *Data presented for need of programming (high levels of multi-lingual learners, lack of middle school afterschool programming)*
 - **P:** *existing skills at the ICC in serving multi-lingual, refugee families.*
- *Program Design*
 - **P:** *Project-based curriculum*
 - **P:** *student choice in programming*
 - **N:** *some missing data on children served.*
 - **P:** *recognition of some faults of previous program (staff turnover, poor recordkeeping) and suggests new policies in place to improve*
 - **P:** *more hours than state minimum proposed for school and summer*
 - **P:** *communication and collaboration described with school day*
 - **N:** *limited information on how the programming will connect to the school day*
 - **P:** *Describes ways of keeping children physically safe and supporting a variety of learning styles*
 - **I:** *Proactive approach to promoting attendance- reaching out to celebrate 30 days of attendance!*
 - **Goals**
 - **Q:** *low number of parent engagement participants (7) proposed to be served by the program and low number of parent survey results that report resources from program are helpful. Interesting given the abstract describes the ICC as a supportive place for families*
- *Program Management*
 - **N:** *Specific qualifications of director not described*
 - **P:** *Collaboration with Westbrook School District described*
 - **P:** *Communication to be translated into preferred languages of families*
 - **P:** *Program provided transportation*

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Westbrook Public Schools and ICC
DATE: 4/30/24
EVALUATOR NAME: Jessie Francis
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

- **P:** process for vetting volunteers described
- *Program Evaluation*
 - **P:** Students suggested for program based on need by district
 - **P:** Ongoing evaluation: formal x3 / year, informal: daily
 - **P:** Student and parent survey
 - **N:** Other evaluation measures/data not described. Though previously in the application they mention the PQA.

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

VI. Budget Proposal

- 1. Budget Narrative*
- 2. Budget Forms*
- 3. Capacity for Success & Sustainability*

- Budget Narrative
 - **3k/RLP**
 - **P:** No fees
- Budget Forms:
 - **P:** In-kind = 19% of budget, 21stCCLC funds = 52% of budget
 - **P:** Private funding incorporated into budget, implies funds are in-hand from donor sources
- *Capacity for Success & Sustainability*
 - **P:** Sustainability plan includes a look at program structures and systems that support the program's ability to operate
 - **N:** No specific indication on how the program will continue to ensure funds to operate the program

Priority Points

- 1. Poverty Level*
- 2. ESEA Accountability Status*
- 3. Other Need*

Information coming from DOE
High number of multi-lingual learners in community and program

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Westbrook Public Schools
DATE: April 20, 2024
EVALUATOR NAME: Luba Greene
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Instructions: *The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by **individual** evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is **required** that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department's RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.*

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Appendix A – Proposal Cover Page

- Renewal

Appendix B – Debarment, Performance, and Non-Collusion Certification

- no notes here

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

- I. *General Information*
 - a. *Abstract*
 - b. *Program Demographics*
 - c. *Partners*

- a. *Abstract*
- b. *Program Demographics: Middle School grades 5-8*
**Negative: low number of parents to be served (7)*
- c. *Partners: Intercultural Community Center (ICC)*

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

- II. *Specifications of Work to be Performed*
 1. *Planning*
 2. *Need for Program*
 3. *Program Design*
 4. *Program Management*

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Westbrook Public Schools
DATE: April 20, 2024
EVALUATOR NAME: Luba Greene
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

5. Program Evaluation

1. Planning
 - *Positives: good timeline of planning
 - *Negative: would have liked to see more district/school involvement
2. Need for Program
 - *High Multilingual population; desire to instill core life skills
3. Program Design:
 - *Positives: ICC already has community support / buy-in; high quality enrichment offerings; rotation of guest speakers & field trips to entice regular attendance; after 30 days attendance call home to thank adult caregivers; Mental Health programming including student-led topics; environmental & nature-based opportunities
 - *Interesting: Family Engagement in conjunction with Adult Education; quarterly newsletter;
 - *Negative: would like to see more concrete examples of student-driven; same with Literacy activities; Physical Activities - 1x/weekly seems low
4. Program Management
 - *Positives: addressing past issues with staffing, record-keeping, reporting; enrichment providers to create 2 weeks' lesson plans and 2 backup plans; ELA & STEM instructors have relevant experience; school leadership support and good fiscal support from school district; volunteer management system; translated communications for accessibility to all
 - *Negative: staff Professional Development needs some common and some choice (not solely choice) and not much mentioned with staff development linkage with school;
5. Program Evaluation
 - *Positives: regular schedule discussed; diverse Advisory Board
 - *Negative: would like to see more detailed sources for evaluations

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

III. Budget Proposal

1. *Budget Narrative*
2. *Budget Forms*
3. *Capacity for Success & Sustainability*

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Westbrook Public Schools
DATE: April 20, 2024
EVALUATOR NAME: Luba Greene
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

1. Budget Narrative
2. Budget Forms
3. Capacity for Success & Sustainability:
*Positives: great key partnerships such as EcoMaine, Portland Public Health; “attend community tabling events”
*Negative: would like to see more details on year to year

Priority Points

1. *Poverty Level*
2. *ESEA Accountability Status*
3. *Other Need*

1. Poverty Level: School is at 66% Free & Reduced Lunch rate
3. Other Need: high Immigrant and Multilingual population / community

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Westbrook Public Schools (ICC)
DATE: 4/17/24
EVALUATOR NAME: RACHELLE TOME
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Instructions: *The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by **individual** evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is **required** that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department's RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.*

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Appendix A – Proposal Cover Page

- P: Renewal 1 @ 66% FRL

Appendix B – Debarment, Performance, and Non-Collusion Certification

- P: Signed

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

- I. General Information*
- Abstract*
 - Program Demographics*
 - Partners*

- P: Indicates partnership with Intercultural Community Center
- P: Program includes support for multi-lingual students; project-based curriculum
- Q: 97% of students served are RLP; 7 parents served; total to be served is 15% of total LP in school
- N: Single partner

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

- II. Specifications of Work to be Performed*
- Planning*
 - Need for Program*
 - Program Design*
 - Program Management*

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Westbrook Public Schools (ICC)
DATE: 4/17/24
EVALUATOR NAME: RACHELLE TOME
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

5. Program Evaluation

- 1. I: Planning took place over just under 2 months; mostly limited to ICC and WMS
- 1. P: Parents not indicated in the planning process
- 2. P: Community needs, specifically those of LP multilingual students, are outlined. ICC focus is on supporting low-income immigrant and refugee families.
- 3. P: Program includes a variety of topics through a project-based curriculum; student choice of activities
- 3. P: Data provided as requested. New policies and consistent staffing noted as changes. SY and summer programming
- 3. P: Current ICC program includes ongoing collaboration with WMS staff and other stakeholders.
- 3. P: Staff expectation outlined, including back-up lesson plans.
- 3. P: Safety measures include attention to individual student needs, including medical or emotional needs.
- 3. P: Use of stent voice to inform programming
- 3. P: Consistent scheduling and incentives help promote regular attendance. Connecting with families for regular attendance and to provide support if needed are elements of the program.
- 4. P: Expectations for program leadership outlined.
- 4. P: Assurance of coordination between school leadership and staff
- 4. I: PD is centered on required safety measures. Additional PD hinges on financial availability
- 4. P: Multiple methods for communication noted with translations available.
- 4. P: Transportation is handled through ICC, in coordination with WSD.
- 5. N: Program elements are outlined with limited explanations related to objective data sources and performance measures.
- 5. P; Periodic evaluations with staff 3 times a year.
- 5. Q: Periodic reviews are presented to the advisory board. No specific mention of parents or other stakeholders.

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

III. Budget Proposal

- 1. Budget Narrative*
- 2. Budget Forms*
- 3. Capacity for Success & Sustainability*

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Westbrook Public Schools (ICC)
DATE: 4/17/24
EVALUATOR NAME: RACHELLE TOME
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

- 1. P: Budget narrative addresses required components.
- 1. P: Transportation costs not mentioned though covered by in-kind
- 1. I: No indication of use Federal or State funds, Local and in kind only.
- 1. P: Fundraising plan noted for program sustainability
- 3. P: Diverse membership on advisory board
- 3. P: Intensive planning process along with the hiring of new staff supports strategies listed to support sustainability, including building strong relationships with community partners.
- 3. P: Consistent involvement of key partners

Priority Points

1. *Poverty Level*
2. *ESEA Accountability Status*
3. *Other Need*

- 21% multi-lingual community



STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Janet T. Mills
Governor

Pender Makin
Commissioner

AGREEMENT AND DISCLOSURE STATEMENT
RFP #: 202312249
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program

I, Jessica Francis, accept the offer to become a member of the Request for Proposals (RFP) Evaluation Team for the State of Maine Department of Education. I do hereby accept the terms set forth in this agreement AND hereby disclose any affiliation or relationship I may have in connection with a bidder who has submitted a proposal to this RFP.

Neither I nor any member of my immediate family have a personal or financial interest, direct or indirect, in the bidders whose proposals I will be reviewing. "Interest" may include, but is not limited to: current or former ownership in the bidder's company; current or former Board membership; current or former employment with the bidder; current or former personal contractual relationship with the bidder (example: paid consultant); and/or current or former relationship to a bidder's official which could reasonably be construed to constitute a conflict of interest (personal relationships may be perceived by the public as a potential conflict of interest).

I have not advised, consulted with or assisted any bidder in the preparation of any proposal submitted in response to this RFP nor have I submitted a letter of support or similar endorsement.

I understand and agree that the evaluation process is to be conducted in an impartial manner without bias or prejudice. In this regard, I hereby certify that, to the best of my knowledge, there are no circumstances that would reasonably support a good faith charge of bias. I further understand that in the event a good faith charge of bias is made, it will rest with me to decide whether I should be disqualified from participation in the evaluation process.

I agree to hold confidential all information related to the contents of Requests for Proposals presented during the review process until such time as the Department formally releases the award decision notices for public distribution.

Jessica Francis
Signature

3/25/24
Date



STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Janet T. Mills
Governor

Pender Makin
Commissioner

AGREEMENT AND DISCLOSURE STATEMENT
RFP #: 202312249

RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program

I, Luba Greene, accept the offer to become a member of the Request for Proposals (RFP) Evaluation Team for the State of Maine Department of Education. I do hereby accept the terms set forth in this agreement AND hereby disclose any affiliation or relationship I may have in connection with a bidder who has submitted a proposal to this RFP.

Neither I nor any member of my immediate family have a personal or financial interest, direct or indirect, in the bidders whose proposals I will be reviewing. "Interest" may include, but is not limited to: current or former ownership in the bidder's company; current or former Board membership; current or former employment with the bidder; current or former personal contractual relationship with the bidder (example: paid consultant); and/or current or former relationship to a bidder's official which could reasonably be construed to constitute a conflict of interest (personal relationships may be perceived by the public as a potential conflict of interest).

I have not advised, consulted with or assisted any bidder in the preparation of any proposal submitted in response to this RFP nor have I submitted a letter of support or similar endorsement.

I understand and agree that the evaluation process is to be conducted in an impartial manner without bias or prejudice. In this regard, I hereby certify that, to the best of my knowledge, there are no circumstances that would reasonably support a good faith charge of bias. I further understand that in the event a good faith charge of bias is made, it will rest with me to decide whether I should be disqualified from participation in the evaluation process.

I agree to hold confidential all information related to the contents of Requests for Proposals presented during the review process until such time as the Department formally releases the award decision notices for public distribution.

Luba Greene
Signature

3/25/24
Date



STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Janet T. Mills
Governor

Pender Makin
Commissioner

AGREEMENT AND DISCLOSURE STATEMENT
RFP #: 202312249

RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program

I, Rachelle Tome, accept the offer to become a member of the Request for Proposals (RFP) Evaluation Team for the State of Maine Department of Education. I do hereby accept the terms set forth in this agreement AND hereby disclose any affiliation or relationship I may have in connection with a bidder who has submitted a proposal to this RFP.

Neither I nor any member of my immediate family have a personal or financial interest, direct or indirect, in the bidders whose proposals I will be reviewing. "Interest" may include, but is not limited to: current or former ownership in the bidder's company; current or former Board membership; current or former employment with the bidder; current or former personal contractual relationship with the bidder (example: paid consultant); and/or current or former relationship to a bidder's official which could reasonably be construed to constitute a conflict of interest (personal relationships may be perceived by the public as a potential conflict of interest).

I have not advised, consulted with or assisted any bidder in the preparation of any proposal submitted in response to this RFP nor have I submitted a letter of support or similar endorsement.

I understand and agree that the evaluation process is to be conducted in an impartial manner without bias or prejudice. In this regard, I hereby certify that, to the best of my knowledge, there are no circumstances that would reasonably support a good faith charge of bias. I further understand that in the event a good faith charge of bias is made, it will rest with me to decide whether I should be disqualified from participation in the evaluation process.

I agree to hold confidential all information related to the contents of Requests for Proposals presented during the review process until such time as the Department formally releases the award decision notices for public distribution.

Rachelle Tome
Signature

3/26/24
Date