



PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF NORTH CAROLINA

State Board of Education | Department of Public Instruction

Report to the North Carolina General Assembly

Extended Learning and Integrated Student
Supports (ELISS) Competitive Grant Program

SL 2021-3, HB196

Date Due: February 15, 2022

DPI Chronological Schedule, 2020-2021

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION VISION: Every public school student in North Carolina will be empowered to accept academic challenges, prepared to pursue their chosen path after graduating high school, and encouraged to become lifelong learners with the capacity to engage in a globally-collaborative society.

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION MISSION: The mission of the North Carolina State Board of Education is to use its constitutional authority to guard and maintain the right of a sound, basic education for every child in North Carolina Public Schools.

ERIC DAVIS

Chair: Charlotte – At-Large

JILL CAMNITZ

Greenville – Northeast Region

TODD CHASTEEN

Blowing Rock – Northwest Region

ALAN DUNCAN

Vice Chair: Greensboro – Piedmont-Triad Region

REGINALD KENAN

Rose Hill – Southeast Region

DONNA TIPTON-ROGERS

Brasstown – Western Region

MARK ROBINSON

Lieutenant Governor: High Point – Ex Officio

AMY WHITE

Garner – North Central Region

J. WENDELL HALL

Ahoskie – At-Large

DALE FOLWELL

State Treasurer: Raleigh – Ex Officio

OLIVIA OXENDINE

Lumberton – Sandhills Region

JAMES FORD

At-Large

CATHERINE TRUITT

Secretary to the Board: Cary

VACANT

Southwest Region

NC DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

Catherine Truitt, State Superintendent :: 301 N. Wilmington Street :: Raleigh, North Carolina 27601-2825

In compliance with federal law, the NC Department of Public Instruction administers all state-operated educational programs, employment activities and admissions without discrimination because of race, religion, national or ethnic origin, color, age, military service, disability, or gender, except where exemption is appropriate and allowed by law.

Inquiries or complaints regarding discrimination issues should be directed to:

Thomas Tomberlin, Director of Educator Recruitment and Support, NCDPI
6301 Mail Service Center, Raleigh, NC 27699-6301 / Phone: (984) 236-2114 / Fax: (984) 236-2099

Visit us on the Web: www.dpi.nc.gov



Extended Learning and Integrated Student Supports (ELISS) Competitive Grant Program: Year 1 Interim Report

Interim Report for School Year 2021-22

Prepared by:

Kathleen Mooney, M.A.
Holli Bayonas, Ph.D.
Wendy McColskey, Ph.D.
Beth Thrift, M.A.
Melissa Williams, M.A.

SERVE Center at UNCG
Gateway University Research Park
Dixon Building
5900 Summit Avenue
Browns Summit, NC 27214

Submitted to:

Federal Program Monitoring and Support Division
North Carolina Department of Public Instruction
Raleigh, North Carolina

January 2022

Table of Contents

I. ELISS Legislation and Grants Awarded.....	1
II. Grantee Implementation	6
III. Summary of ELISS Program Services To-Date.....	19
Appendix.....	20

Extended Learning and Integrated Student Supports (ELISS) Competitive Grant Program: Year 1 Interim Report

I. ELISS Legislation and Grants Awarded

Legislation Overview

The General Assembly of North Carolina utilized Session Law 2021-3 House Bill 196 to appropriate fifteen million dollars (\$15,000,000) from the Federal Coronavirus Response and Relief Supplemental Appropriations Act (CRRSA) funds for the two-year Extended Learning and Integrated Student Supports (ELISS) Competitive Grant Program. The purpose of the Extended Learning and Integrated Student Supports Competitive Grant Program (ELISS) is to fund high-quality, independently validated extended learning and integrated student support service programs for at-risk students whose learning has been negatively affected by COVID-19 impacts.

While February reporting to the Joint Education Oversight Committee is required in the legislation, it is important to note that the ELISS grantees were approved by the State Board of Education (SBE) in October 2021; and thus, this first report only describes what is known about the grantees during the two months after being notified of their ELISS award (i.e., October 6th to December 15th).

According to the legislation, ELISS-funded programs should aim to raise standards for student academic outcomes by focusing on the following:

- a. *Use of an evidence-based model with a proven track record of success.*
- b. *Inclusion of rigorous, quantitative performance measures to confirm effectiveness of the program.*
- c. *Deployment of multiple tiered supports in schools to address student barriers to achievement, such as strategies to improve chronic absenteeism, antisocial behaviors, academic growth, and enhancement of parent and family engagement.*
- d. *Alignment with State performance measures, student academic goals, and the North Carolina Standard Course of Study.*
- e. *Prioritization in programs to integrate clear academic content, in particular, science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) learning opportunities or reading development and proficiency instruction.*
- f. *Minimization of student class size when providing instruction or instructional supports and interventions.*
- g. *Expansion of student access to high-quality learning activities and academic support that strengthen student engagement and leverage community-based resources, which may include organizations that provide mentoring services and private-sector employer involvement.*
- h. *Utilization of digital content to expand learning time, when appropriate.*



Further, the legislation states that “grants shall be used to award funds for new or existing eligible programs for at-risk students operated by (i) nonprofit corporations and (ii) nonprofit corporations working in collaboration with local school administrative units ” and that programs must serve one or more of the following student groups.

- *At-risk students not performing at grade level as demonstrated by statewide assessments, or not on-track to meet year-end expectations, as demonstrated by existing indicators, including teacher identification;*
- *students at-risk of dropout;*
- *students at-risk of school displacement due to suspension or expulsion as a result of anti-social behaviors.*

The legislation required priority consideration be given to:

- *applicants demonstrating models that focus services and programs in schools that are identified as low-performing pursuant to G.S. 11C-105.37;*
- *nonprofit corporations working in partnership with a local school administrative unit resulting in a match utilizing federal funds under Part A of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended, or Title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended, and other federal or local funds.¹*

In terms of required grantee reporting, the legislation indicates that grantees shall:

- *report to the Department of Public Instruction for the year in which grant funds were expended on the progress of the Program, including alignment with State academic standards, data collection for reporting student progress, the source and amount of matching funds, and other measures, and*
- *also submit a final report on key performance data, including statewide test results, attendance rates, graduation rates, and promotion rates, and financial sustainability of the program.*

In terms of the Department of Public Instruction (referred to as NCDPI) reporting to the Joint Legislative Education Oversight Committee (JLEOC), the legislation specifies the following:

The Department of Public Instruction shall provide a report on the Program to the Joint Legislative Education Oversight Committee by February 15 of each year following the year in which grant funds are awarded. The report shall include the results of the Program and recommendations regarding effective program models, standards, and performance measures based on student performance; leveraging of community-based resources to expand student access to learning activities; academic and behavioral support services; and potential opportunities for the State to invest in proven models for future grants programs.

As noted above, the timing of this first February 15 report to the JLEOC reflects what is known about grantees over the past two months (i.e., since they were approved by the SBE to receive an

¹ The legislation states, “a nonprofit corporation may act as its own fiscal agent for the purposes of this Program”.



ELISS award). The SERVE Center at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro (SERVE) contracted with NCDPI to provide application review and evaluation reporting support in three areas: (1) the internal grant application/addendum review process, (2) the implementation and outcome data collection by grantees, and (3) the development of the final report from NCDPI due to the Joint Legislative Education Oversight Committee on February 15 of each year (following the year in which grant funds are awarded).

Thus, this document was developed under a contract with SERVE to fulfill the requirement to submit a report of the ELISS Program's grant-funded activities implemented during the 2021 calendar year. As previously mentioned, because the grantees received notice of the awards in October 2021, this reporting only covers approximately two months of start-up activities by the ELISS grantees.

Grants Awarded

On May 17, 2021, the request for proposal (RFP) for the ELISS Program was made available (via mailing lists and the NCDPI website) and a virtual technical assistance webinar was conducted on May 25, 2021. Then, on June 1, 2021, the NCDPI Comprehensive Continuous Improvement Plan (CCIP) system was activated for ELISS applications to be submitted. The deadline for the final submission of applications was noon on August 11, 2021.

A total of 43 applications were submitted (uploaded in the CCIP system) and were eligible for the Level I and Level II review processes.

As part of the Level I review process:

- Reviewers (selected by SERVE based on their experience and knowledge) used an Application Rubric to guide scoring (see Appendix)
- Each application received three reviews (resulting in three individual scores that were averaged for a total Level I score)
- There was a maximum possible application score of 105 points

As part of the Level II review process:

- Priority points were applied for applications that met priority considerations (0-4 points)
- Technical deductions were assigned for applications not addressing various RFP requirements (0-9 points)

Using the results from the Level I and Level II review process, the Federal Program Monitoring and Support Division Director at NCPDI presented the score results to the State Board of Education (SBE) for approval². The SBE approved the awards to ELISS grantees on October 7,

² Note: In past ELISS competitions, competitive priority was given to proposals that provided services to at-risk students living in the state's most economically distressed counties designated as Tier 1 or Tier 2 by the North Carolina Department of Commerce; however, for this 2021 ELISS competition, no priority consideration was given based on region served since at least two ELISS grants were eligible to be awarded per each SBE region pending submission of quality applications by at least two eligible organizations in the SBE region following Level I and Level II reviews. After regional awardees were identified, additional organizations were recommended for the award based on total application score and ranking.



2021; however, awards could be retroactively used to support ELISS activities starting on July 1, 2021.

The legislation specified funding for two types of programs: (1) Extended Learning and (2) Integrated Student Supports. The following definitions of these two types of eligible programs were included in the application guidance materials:

- Extended Learning (EL): defined as “services and activities that are offered to at-risk students in times outside of the traditional school day. EL may include ELISS programs offered before school, after school, on Saturdays, summers, and intercessions.”
- Integrated Student Supports (ISS): described by research conducted by Child Trends³ as “a school-based approach to supporting students’ academic success by developing or acquiring and coordinating supports that target academic and non-academic barriers to achievement.”

Table 1 shows the grants awarded by whether they planned to operate an EL program (including programming after school, before school, and/or during summer), an ISS program (support to at-risk students during the school day), or both (Extended Learning + Integrated Student Supports). Overall,

- 5 grantees proposed implementing only EL programs (total of \$2,218,750).
- 6 grantees proposed implementing only ISS programs (total of \$1,715,647).
- 8 grantees proposed implementing programs with both EL and ISS components (total of \$3,477,495).

Table 1. ELISS Grant Awards (2021)

Type of Grant	Organization Name	SBE Region	County	Total Year 1 Funding Amount
Extended Learning (EL)	FBC-W CSA dba Charlotte Community Services Association	Southwest	Mecklenburg	\$258,750
	Legacy Mayfield Empowerment Center	Southwest	Mecklenburg	\$500,000
	McCloud’s Computer & Skills Training Center	Northeast	Pitt	\$460,000
	The Excel Community Association of Alamance	Piedmont-Triad	Alamance	\$500,000
	YMCA of the Triangle Area	North Central	Wake	\$500,000
Subtotal				\$2,218,750
Integrated Student Supports (ISS)	Book Harvest	North Central	Durham	\$500,000
	Communities In Schools of Brunswick County	Southeast	Brunswick	\$276,997
	Communities In Schools of North Carolina	North Central	Granville	\$156,710
	Communities In Schools of Randolph County	Piedmont-Triad	Randolph	\$78,969
	FIRST North Carolina	North Central	Harnett	\$202,971
	United Way of Pitt County	Northeast	Pitt	\$500,000
Subtotal				\$1,715,647

³ Moore, K.A. (2014). Making The Grade: Assessing the Evidence for integrated student supports. Child Trends. Retrieved from: <https://www.childtrends.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/02/2014-07ISSPaper2.pdf>



Type of Grant	Organization Name	SBE Region	County	Total Year 1 Funding Amount
Extended Learning and Integrated Student Supports (EL + ISS)	Boys & Girls Club of Cabarrus County	Southwest	Cabarrus	\$500,000
	Children First/Communities In Schools of Buncombe County	Western	Buncombe	\$482,588
	Communities In Schools of Cape Fear	Southeast	New Hanover and Pender	\$500,000
	Communities In Schools of Durham	North Central	Durham	\$500,000
	Communities In Schools of Montgomery County	Sandhills	Montgomery	\$500,000
	Communities In Schools of Robeson County	Sandhills	Robeson	\$339,170
	Communities In Schools of Wake County	North Central	Wake	\$155,737
	Student U	North Central	Durham	\$500,000
				Subtotal
Grand Total Awarded				\$7,411,892

The 19 grantees that received awards were located in seven of the eight regions of the state⁴ with the North Central Region receiving the highest number (i.e., 7 of the 19 awards). The initial combined amount approved to award to the grantees was \$7,411,892 to serve a total of 15 counties, with awards ranging from \$78,969 to \$500,000 per year.

Data Sources for the Final Report

SERVE used three primary data sources to develop this 2021-22 Interim ELISS Report: (1) state-level program documentation, (2) grantee applications and logic models, and (3) grantee-level implementation reports.

1. State-level program documentation – SERVE reviewed and referenced the request for proposal and various state-level documentation presented by the Federal Program Monitoring and Support Division Director at NCPDI to the State Board of Education (SBE) on October 7, 2021. These documents provide detailed information regarding ELISS funding priorities, quality review scores, funding availability, budget/match requirements, application review process, and the final recommendations for ELISS subgrantee awards approved by the SBE.
2. Grantee applications and logic models – Logic models for each awarded grantee were developed by SERVE in collaboration with grantee and NCDPI staff during virtual technical assistance calls in November and December 2021. Information gathered during the grantee technical assistance calls provided context for descriptions of the grantee program (including current stages of operation and any changes to programming compared to what was proposed in the original grant application).
3. Grantee-level implementation reports – SERVE developed and administered an interim reporting process for grantees to provide updates of their ELISS activities during the 2021 calendar year. A guidance document and accompanying reporting link were sent to ELISS Program Directors on November 15, 2021 (with a due date of December 15,

⁴ The Northwest Region was the only region not represented (as no application addendum was submitted from this region).



2021). All grantees were required to submit an interim report reflecting planning/implementation activities that occurred over the two months since they received notice of their ELISS award. SERVE conducted an inventory of all monthly report data and shared findings with NCDPI for monitoring purposes.

II. Grantee Implementation

COVID-19 Context

Education worldwide was disrupted by the COVID-19 pandemic. During the summer of 2020, the SBE and NCDPI, in consultation with the North Carolina Department of Health and Human Services (NCDHHS), developed a resource document in response to the COVID-19 public health crisis, *Lighting Our Way Forward: North Carolina's Guidebook for Reopening Public Schools*.⁵ The document advised that, as schools and communities across North Carolina worked to operationalize the recommendations from the SBE, NCDPI, and NCDHHS, “it is critical to be intentional and prepared for change as the year unfolds in light of public health needs.”

Thus, as communities continue to navigate an unprecedented educational landscape, ELISS grantees have been awarded to provide extended learning and integrated support services for at-risk students that had been negatively affected by COVID-19 impacts (retroactively starting July 1, 2021 through the 2022-23 school year).

Overview of Grantee Programs

A total of 19 grantees were awarded funds to implement an ELISS program. Five grantees proposed to implement an extended learning (EL) program, six proposed to implement an integrated student support (ISS) program, and eight proposed to implement a program with both EL and ISS components (EL+ISS).

In terms of timelines, the recommended ELISS grantees were approved for funding on October 7, 2021, by the SBE. After all approved organizations were notified, on-boarding webinars were conducted to provide new grantees with technical assistance regarding budget approvals, vendor verification, ERaCA access, data collection, and evaluation reporting (i.e., October 19 and 20 and November 2).

It is important to note that some grantees used the ELISS award to continue and/or expand programming that was already in place—while other grantees used the award to start new programming. Thus, as mentioned previously, at the time the data were collected not all grantees had started implementing their proposed extended learning and/or integrated student support initiatives. Table 2 shows the grantees’ operational status (i.e., planning, partial, full

⁵ <https://www.dpi.nc.gov/news/covid-19-response-resources/lighting-our-way-forward>



implementation), as reflected in information submitted by grantees in their interim implementation reports (due to NCDPI from grantees on or before December 15, 2021).

Table 2. ELISS Grantees by Operational Status (as of December 15, 2021)

Designated Type of Program	Organization Name	Phase of Operation		
		Planning	Partial	Full
Extended Learning (EL)	FBC-W CSA dba Charlotte Community Services Association			✓
	Legacy Mayfield Empowerment Center	✓		
	McCloud’s Computer & Skills Training Center	✓		
	The Excel Community Association of Alamance			✓
	YMCA of the Triangle Area		✓	
Integrated Student Supports (ISS)	Book Harvest	✓		
	Communities In Schools of Brunswick County		✓	
	Communities In Schools of North Carolina	✓		
	Communities In Schools of Randolph County	✓		
	FIRST North Carolina	✓		
	United Way of Pitt County			✓
EL and ISS	Boys & Girls Club of Cabarrus County		✓	
	Children First/Communities In Schools of Buncombe County *		✓	
	Communities In Schools of Cape Fear			✓
	Communities In Schools of Durham	✓		
	Communities In Schools of Montgomery County		✓	
	Communities In Schools of Robeson County	✓		
	Communities In Schools of Wake County	✓		
	Student U			✓
Total		9	5	5

Source: ELISS Grantee Interim Implementation Report (2021).

Note: Operational Status Definitions: (a) **Planning** Phase - includes grantees that had not served students using ELISS funding on or before December 15, 2021; (b) **Partial** Operation – includes grantees that had served students using ELISS funding; however, on or before December 15, 2021 they were not currently providing EL and ISS programming as proposed or they were not serving students at all program sites proposed; (c) **Full** Operation – includes grantees that had provided students with EL and/or ISS components as proposed at each of the program sites identified in the grant application. (This determination does not reflect plans for proposed summer programming.)

*Approved program amendment indicates change from EL and ISS (as identified in grant application) to ISS programming only.

As of the interim reporting (December 15, 2021), 10 grantees were at-least partially operating their ELISS-funded sites—while 9 grantees were still in the planning phase. The majority of the grantees in the planning phase indicated that they planned to start operating their ELISS-funded sites/programming in January 2022. Furthermore, as indicated by interim reporting, COVID continues to create challenges for some grantees in terms of hiring staff and recruiting/enrolling students.

According to the RFP, the ELISS grant can serve at-risk students from grades K-12. Table 3 shows the school-level of students (i.e., elementary school, middle school, high school) that ELISS grantees are currently serving and/or plan to serve during the 2021-22 school year.

Table 3. School-Level of Students Targeted by ELISS Grantees

Originally Designated Type of Program	Organization Name	School Level of Students Targeted		
		Elem	Middle	High
	FBC-W CSA dba Charlotte Community Services Association		✓	✓



Originally Designated Type of Program	Organization Name	School Level of Students Targeted		
		Elem	Middle	High
Extended Learning (EL)	Legacy Mayfield Empowerment Center	✓		
	McCloud's Computer & Skills Training Center	✓		
	The Excel Community Association of Alamance	✓	✓	
	YMCA of the Triangle Area	✓	✓	
Integrated Student Supports (ISS)	Book Harvest	✓		
	Communities In Schools of Brunswick County	✓	✓	
	Communities In Schools of North Carolina		✓	✓
	Communities In Schools of Randolph County			✓
	FIRST North Carolina	✓	✓	
	United Way of Pitt County	✓		
EL and ISS	Boys & Girls Club of Cabarrus County	✓		
	Children First/Communities In Schools of Buncombe County*	✓	✓	
	Communities In Schools of Cape Fear	✓	✓	✓
	Communities In Schools of Durham		✓	✓
	Communities In Schools of Montgomery County		✓	
	Communities In Schools of Robeson County	✓	✓	✓
	Communities In Schools of Wake County	✓	✓	
	Student U			✓
Total		13	12	7

Source: ELISS proposal and interim reports.

A total of 13 grantees are focusing on elementary students, 12 are focusing on middle grades students, and 7 are focusing on high school students. The majority of grantees plan to focus on multiple school-levels. More specifically, 6 grantees are focusing their programming on elementary and middle school students, three grantees focusing on middle and high school students, and 2 grantees focusing on students that span elementary, middle, and high school. However, some grantees have chosen to target their ELISS services to a specific school-level. For example, 5 grantees focus only on elementary school students, 1 focuses only on middle school students, and 2 focus on only high school students.

Description of Grantees

This section of the report briefly describes grantees categorized by the “type” of program (i.e., EL, ISS, and EL+ISS). The descriptions were provided by the grantees as part of the implementation reporting process (with only minor edits from SERVE, as needed). More specifically, grantees were instructed to provide one paragraph to “*briefly describe your ELISS-funded program’s: (a) goals in terms of desired outcomes for students who participate/are served and (b) how your services will contribute to those outcomes.*”

Extended Learning (EL)

As indicated in the ELISS legislation, EL is defined as “*services and activities that are offered to at-risk students in times outside of the traditional school day. EL may include ELISS programs offered before school, after school, on Saturdays, summers, and intercessions.*” Five organizations will focus primarily on EL programs for at-risk students.



1. **FBC-W CSA dba Charlotte Community Services Association.** Charlotte Community Services Association (CSA) provides a career coaching program for middle school students in an afterschool/summer setting through the application of a career literacy and exploration curriculum, development of student high school/postsecondary action plans and career action plans, and staff and parent training. They seek to offer a quality afterschool/summer experience for school and career exploration with an emphasis on career and soft skills instruction, homework assistance, and tutoring for at-risk students in grades 6th-10th.
2. **Legacy Mayfield Empowerment Center.** The center's ELISS-funded programming will provide afterschool and summer programming to elementary students via: (a) use of an evidence-based model with a proven track record of success, (b) deployment of supports to address student's barriers to achievement, such as strategies to improve chronic absenteeism, antisocial behaviors, academic growth, and enhancement of parent and family engagement, and (c) expansion of student access to high-quality learning activities and academic support that strengthens student engagement and leverage community-based resources.
3. **McClouds Computer and Skills Training Center.** The center's ELISS-funded programming will provide afterschool and summer programming for elementary students to support Pitt County Schools (PCS) in reaching the following goals: increase students' performance in reading and math; increase students' performance on report card grades for reading and math; decrease number of discipline incidents or suspensions; and improve school attendance.
4. **The Excel Community Association of Alamance.** Excel Community Association of Alamance (EXCEL) will provide a year-round afterschool program to support elementary and middle school students in grades K-8. To achieve their program goals, they will provide students with 33 weeks of programming during the academic year and 6 weeks of the summer program. The summer camp will provide students with six weeks of remediation and reinforcement of previous learning. The online tutorials program will allow students to work at their learning level and achieve improved mastery of learning objectives. Students will engage in Social-Emotional Learning (SEL) by participating in the Sanford Harmony SEL program. This program addresses behavior and strengthens the character needed to help students be successful in/out of the classroom.
5. **YMCA of Triangle Area.** The YMCA of the Triangle will support at-risk youth through afterschool Y Learning Programs at low-performing schools throughout Wake County. The Y Learning Programs will include focused literacy instruction provided by the HELPS (Helping Early Literacy with Practice Strategies) Program. Y Learning also includes daily social-emotional learning (SEL) delivered by trained YMCA youth counselors. SEL is essential for healthy coping skills, positive interpersonal skills, and self-advocacy—and especially critical now to help youth cope with the effects of isolation due to COVID and increasing reports of depression and anxiety. The YMCA will further support at-risk youth through Camp High Hopes summer day camp at six sites in Durham and Wake Counties in the summers of 2022 and 2023. Camp High Hopes



provides daily academic instruction in reading and math by certified teachers as part of traditional summer camp fun—arts and crafts, recreation, swimming lessons, sports, leadership training, and SEL.

Integrated Student Supports (ISS)

As conveyed in the ELISS legislation, ISS is defined as “*a school-based approach to supporting students’ academic success by developing or acquiring and coordinating supports that target academic and non-academic barriers to achievement.*” Six organizations will focus primarily on ISS programs for at-risk students.

1. **Book Harvest.** The ELISS-funded programming, RECONNECTING WITH READING: Post-COVID Recovery, is a multi-tiered, evidence-based program for Durham Public Schools students in grades K – 5. The intensive wraparound program model is designed to improve targeted students’ reading proficiency by: increasing students’ reading fluency, increasing students’ motivation to read, and increasing the amount of time students read independently at school, at home, and over the subsequent summer months. The grantee will achieve these goals by implementing three activities: Helping Early Literacy with Practice Solutions (HELPS) One-On-One Tutoring, Classroom Library Revitalization, and Book Provision for Summer Break. These activities will deliver targeted instruction in reading fluency and provide ample books in students' classrooms and during the summer break in order for students to practice their reading and grow their skills.
2. **CIS of Brunswick County.** The mission of Communities In Schools (CIS) of Brunswick County is “*to surround students with a community of support, empowering them to stay in school and achieve in life*”. CIS of Brunswick County is an affiliate of CIS, a national organization with independent affiliates across the US, providing dropout prevention programs in local schools. CIS implements the CIS Model of Integrated Student Supports using a Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) framework, which is also used by the school district. This three-tiered model focuses on Tier 1 school-wide supports designed to reach at least 75% of the school's student population during each school year by providing school wide programs and meeting basic needs. In addition, Tier II and III services are provided through individualized Student Support Plans developed prior to service implementation. These plans are developed for each student through the Success Coach's review of the student's past school year performance related to attendance, behavior, and academic achievement, as well as a review of any significant personal, familial, peer, or mental health issues that may be adversely impacting the student's success in school. The short-term goal for all students served is to keep them in school and engaged in learning and positive peer relationships. The long-term goal is for students to make progress allowing them to be successfully promoted to the next grade at the end of the school year and ultimately to graduate from high school ready to pursue college, career, trade school or military service.
3. **CIS of North Carolina.** CIS of North Carolina’s goal is to surround students with a community of support, empowering them to stay in school and achieve in life. The



desired outcomes for case-managed students are increases in school attendance, decreases in negative or disruptive student behavior, improved completion of coursework, increases in parental engagement, and improvements in social/emotional skills. The grantee's evidence-based services are proven to meet the needs of individual students, and to contribute to the overall positive culture of the school.

4. **CIS Randolph.** The primary goal for CIS Randolph at Asheboro High School (AHS) is to increase student engagement and success in school; as evidenced by increased attendance rates, decreased discipline referrals and documented growth in academic pursuits. The CIS model uses wraparound supports within a case management framework for targeted students to provide individualized or small group services. These services will be provided by a specifically trained Success Coach, to be embedded full time at AHS, beginning January 18, 2022. Integrated services will include, but not be limited to mentoring, motivational interventions, social and emotional learning assessments and interventions, attendance incentives and behavioral interventions to support the growth of small groups, large groups and for individual students. The CIS Success Coach will serve students directly and recruit community volunteers to assist in the afore-mentioned interventions. Parents of the students will also be engaged through 1-2 community meetups during which they can become familiar with the goals and supports their students are receiving.
5. **FIRST North Carolina.** FIRST North Carolina, a nonprofit that provides preK-12 grade robotics programs that inspires the next generation of engineers, computer scientists and STEM leaders, has partnered with Harnett County Schools to implement the curriculum for four of the project-based FIRST programs in two elementary schools and two middle schools. Anticipated outcomes for all grades and schools include student increased interested in STEM, increased awareness of the roles of STEM in our world, increased awareness of STEM careers and increased application of STEM concepts in coursework. In addition, students will demonstrate increased social emotional learning through increased feelings of connectedness and belonging as they increase their understanding and practice of the FIRST ethos of Gracious Professionalism and "Coopertition". FIRST programs provide hands-on, project-based learning experiences that promote the practice of creativity, innovation and perseverance. FIRST North Carolina will provide professional development and on-going support for teachers in the targeted schools to deliver the programs during the school day. FIRST North Carolina will also work closely with the schools for the end-of-semester showcase events that will share with the community the hard-work and achievements of the participating students.
6. **United Way of Pitt County.** The United Way of Pitt County Early Grades Student Success Academy (EG-SSA) ELISS program offers developmentally appropriate services to third grade students in 12 targeted schools using the Integrated Student Supports (ISS) model that includes five components: needs assessments, data tracking, coordinated student support, community partnerships, and integration of the model in the school



setting (Moore et al., 2017). The intensive recovery and acceleration approach combats the impact of COVID-19 on these young learners who will experience high stakes testing for the first time this year. The program incorporates our existing EG-SSA framework of Academic Support; Safe, Supportive Learning Environment and Family Engagement assisting in children's academic and non-academic needs. Reducing the student-teacher ratios in these third-grade classrooms will ensure students make more rapid educational progress with personalized attention than students in larger classrooms, resulting in academic proficiency as measured by EOG Reading and Math. Teachers will be able to increase communication between the home and school, as well as work to eliminate opportunity gaps for students.

Extended Learning + Integrated Student Supports (EL+ISS)

Eight organizations received ELISS funding to provide a combination of EL and ISS services (with six of the eight grantees being Community In Schools affiliates).

1. **CIS of Cape Fear.** Through this ELISS project, and working in collaboration with New Hanover and Pender County Schools, CIS Cape Fear Student Support Specialists will provide integrated supports to targeted students at eleven high need schools across both counties, six of which have been identified by the State as low performing, with the goals of mitigating COVID-19 related impacts—specifically: improving attendance, improving academic achievement, decreasing behavior referrals and increasing parental involvement. Also, two Re-engagement Coordinators will work with smaller caseloads of New Hanover High School students who have been identified as having been significantly disengaged and/or negatively impacted through COVID-19 school closures and remote learning. Additionally, an academically focused afterschool program will provide targeted remediation, enrichment, and SEL supports at CIS Cape Fear's youth center in downtown Wilmington, while high-energy, literacy-based, Children's Defense Fund Freedom Schools® will provide 6-weeks of engaging summer programming. Finally, as appropriate, students will also be referred to the existing CIS 21st Century Community Learning Center Afterschool Programs available at each of the Pender County schools included within this project.
2. **CIS of Durham.** CIS of Durham (CISD) will use ELISS grant funding to expand its footprint in Durham public schools by employing two Success Coaches at George L. Carrington and James E. Shepard Magnet Middle Schools and two Graduation Coaches at Northern and Hillside High Schools. The coaches will offer CIS's three-tiered programming, including school-wide and targeted supports, as well as directly partnering with at-risk students to ensure they receive the resources and services necessary to succeed in and outside the classroom. The program will be led by a Graduation Coach in the high school setting and a Success Coach in middle school. Strong working relationships between Coaches, students and students' families, school staff, and community partners are essential to the program's success. Similarly, the CIS Success Coach model provides the same tailored services and support as the Graduation Coaches, but with greater focus on extended learning with middle school children. Services provided include basic needs provision, academic mentoring, cultural awareness



programs, individual counseling, and support groups. Coaches can provide ISS school-wide and individually, based on needs assessments developed collaboratively with school principals and teachers.

3. **CIS of Montgomery County.** Project METAL (Montgomery’s Excellence Through Academic Leadership) is a partnership between CIS of Montgomery County (CISMC) and Montgomery County Schools (MCS) to provide high-quality extended learning and integrated student support services, whose learning has been adversely impacted by COVID-19. Project METAL will contribute to the outcomes of improved academic performance, improved social-emotional skills, and expanded family engagement through the implementation of an evidence-based model and core components including: Second Step, Botvin LifeSkills, Project Lead the Way (PLTW), Advancement Via Individual Determination (AVID), Edmentum, and the Strengthening Families program.
4. **CIS of Robeson County.** CIS of Robeson County will begin new programming in three feeder schools. For all three schools, this includes the ABC plus P and Social/Emotional Learning. A = Attendance, B = Behavior, C = Course Work and P is for Parental Engagement. The main goal is to begin effective programming in these three schools to address an identified population of at-risk students of having a high risk of not being successful in school based on one or more of the above-mentioned areas for the CIS model. All three schools will follow the model, but the focus will be different for each, based on the identified needs from administration. The ultimate goal is to provide opportunities for success and to ensure students are on track for graduating from high school with their identified cohorts. Emphasis will be placed on building resiliency and improving self-esteem and efficacy.
5. **CIS of Wake County.** Project CHAMPS (Communities Helping to Academically Motivate and Prepare Students) will provide programs and services, during the regular school day or after school, targeting K-8 students at three Wake County schools: East Millbrook Middle School (EMMS), Neuse River Middle School (NRMS), and The Exploris School (TES). For EMMS and NRMS, CIS Wake will provide academic enrichment after school. The afterschool program will incorporate four primary components to help students progress academically: STEM engagement, interactive instruction, homework assistance and social and emotional learning (SEL). For TES, CIS Wake will place a Success Coach to support students with challenges that impede classroom learning. The Success Coach will connect students with evidence-based interventions, integrated student supports and other resources. They will also incorporate SEL to support student growth. The Success Coach co-develops individualized goals with students around an ABC's framework—Attendance, Behavior and/or Core Course Success.
6. **Boys & Girls Club of Cabarrus County.** The Boys and Girls Club of Cabarrus County through ADVANCEMENT are collaborating with Cabarrus County Schools to provide evidence-based extended learning to high need K-5 students in five elementary schools with goals and outcomes to (a) improve academic outcomes; (b) increase social-emotional supports; and (c) expand family engagement. Key services during afterschool



and summer programs that will contribute to these outcomes include: monitoring, tutoring, mentoring, and remediation in academic subjects; as well as social-emotional interventions and enrichment activities designed to improve academic achievement, critical thinking, collaboration, and problem-solving. The summer programs will feature field trips (in-person or virtual) to local STEM industries to promote STEM engagement and interest in STEM careers. In addition, the grantee will work with partners to help families become and stay involved in their child's education, including STEM industry engagement, literacy support, family nights, Parent Advisory Boards, and the evidence-based Strengthening Families Program.

7. **Student U.** At the beginning of high school, students and families receive advising on the best course options to prepare their student to be college bound. The summers before their transition into the 9th and 10th grade school years, students enroll in a full five weeks of academic classes, which are taught by professional teachers and community experts to prepare them for the rigor of high school. It is also during the 9th grade summer when students meet their High School Advocate. Through weekly one-on-one meetings, constant communication with students' teachers and parents, and regular reporting to Student U's central office staff, Advocates ensure that students remain on-track to graduate on time. When students face academic or social/emotional challenges, Advocates collaborate with all stakeholders to determine appropriate interventions, including direct support from Student U's full-time Social Worker or Learning Specialist, engaging in school remediation programming, or referral to outside agencies. All students in the high school program have access to high-quality, regular tutoring at no cost, and these tutoring services help ensure that students are mastering the academic content needed to succeed in and graduate from high school. While remaining on-track to graduate on time, Student U students are exposed to unique opportunities not found within traditional school offerings to demonstrate to students the long-term benefits of school success. U-Prep Days provide insight into potential college and career paths. STEM-based and other internship opportunities offer students a sense of the satisfaction that comes from a fulfilling career. In-state college tours, College Bound 101 workshops, ACT preparation classes, and individualized college advising, all lead to Decision Day where students take center stage and declare where they will share their brilliance in college, the military, or the workforce.

One grantee, Children First/CIS of Buncombe County, originally proposed implementing both EL and ISS components; however, they submitted a program change amendment to NCDPI to reflect their intent to implement ISS services only because they were awarded a 21st Century Community Learning Center Cohort 15 grant for afterschool programming.

8. **Children First/CIS of Buncombe County.** Children First/CIS of Buncombe County follows the national CIS model and places Student Support Specialists in Asheville area schools serving youth in grades K-6 to improve outcomes related to attendance, behavior, coursework, parent engagement, and social-emotional learning. In the 2021-2022 school year, they plan to serve students in at least six schools, representing 75% of each school's population. The Student Support Specialists will also provide 5%-10% of students from each school with dedicated case management.



Summary of Types of Academic and Behavioral Support Services Provided ELISS Participants

Extended Learning programs can provide both afterschool programs and summer programs. Integrated Student Support programs can provide both case-managed student support and whole-school programs. Thus, Table 4 provides a summary of the number and types of ELISS-funded program components that grantees plan to implement.

Table 4. ELISS Grantees by Type of ELISS-funded Program Component

Grantee	Extended Learning (EL) Program Components		Integrated Student Support (ISS) Program Components	
	Afterschool Program	Summer Program	Case Management (Tier II and III)	Tier I
Book Harvest			✓	✓
Boys & Girls Club of Cabarrus County	✓	✓		
Children First/Communities In Schools of Buncombe County			✓	✓
Communities In Schools of Brunswick County			✓	✓
Communities In Schools of Cape Fear	✓	✓	✓	✓
Communities In Schools of Durham			✓	✓
Communities In Schools of Montgomery County	✓	✓	✓	✓
Communities In Schools of North Carolina			✓	✓
Communities In Schools of Randolph County			✓	✓
Communities In Schools of Robeson County	✓	✓	✓	
Communities In Schools of Wake County	✓		✓	✓
FBC-WCSA dba Charlotte Community Services Association	✓	✓		
FIRST North Carolina			✓	✓
Legacy Mayfield Empowerment Center	✓	✓		
McCloud's Computer & Skills Training Center	✓	✓		
Student U	✓	✓	✓	✓
The Excel Community Association of Alamance	✓	✓		
United Way of Pitt County			✓	✓
YMCA of the Triangle Area	✓	✓		
Total Number of Grantees:	11	10	13	12

In summary, as indicated in Table 4:

- 11 grantees plan to use ELISS funds to support afterschool programming for at-risk students.
- 10 grantees indicated that they plan to use ELISS resources to partially- or fully-fund summer programming for students.
- 13 grantees are currently or plan to use ELISS funds to implement an integrated student support case management approach to help support students identified as at-risk by providing high-intensity, targeted services (i.e., Tier II and III services).



- 12 grantees indicated that they provided Tier I services (e.g., providing school supplies, STEAM enrichment, guest speakers, family engagement nights, food distribution, social-emotional curriculum, and technology support).

Students Reported as Served by ELISS-Funded Programs

Serving At-Risk Students

Of the grantees that are currently providing or planning to provide extended learning, the majority indicated that they determined student eligibility by looking at student-level academic data. Other methods of referral mentioned were via families and success coaches. Of the grantees that are currently providing or planning to provide integrated student support, the majority relied on student-level academic data. In addition to academic data, grantees providing ISS supports also mentioned the use of coach screening, parent referrals, self-referral, and peer referrals to determine student eligibility for ELISS-funded programming.

As part of the Year 1 interim implementation reporting process, if grantees had begun to implement their proposed programming, they were asked to cumulatively report data on students served via EL programming and/or via ISS programming (e.g., case management, tutoring, and other individualized supports). Table 5 summarizes the (a) number of grantees reporting students served, (b) number of students served, and (b) average hours of services received per student on or before December 15, 2021.

Table 5. Reported Number of Students Served and Average Hours of Services Received

Type of Programing	# Grantees Reporting Students Served	Total # Students Reported Served	Average Hours Served Per Student
EL	5	384 students	40 average hours
Tier II and III	6	1,902 students	16 average hours
Tier I	6	13,658 students	N/A

Note. Average hours, per student, not applicable and, thus, not collected for Tier I services.

As indicated in Table 5:

- Across grantees that were operational and providing EL programs, 5 grantees reported that a total of **384 students** participated in their afterschool programs, with **40 average hours** of services received per student.
- Across grantees that were operational and providing Tier II and III ISS services, 6 grantees reported that a total of **1,902 students** received case-managed services in 2021, with **16 average hours** of services received per student.
- Across grantees that were operational and providing Tier I ISS services, 6 grantees reported that a total of **13,658 students** were provided short-term, as needed services in 2021.



Program Implementation Features Mentioned in Legislation

Mitigation of COVID-19

As part of the interim reporting process, grantees were asked “*Has your program had any issues with staffing as a result of COVID-19 mitigation/screening policies?*” Three grantees indicated that they had issues with staffing as a result of COVID. The issues reported were related to quarantining, staff not wanting to get in close contact with unvaccinated students and needing to take time off to care for family that contracted COVID.

In addition, grantees were asked “*Has your program had any issues with student attendance/participation as a result of COVID-19 mitigation/screening policies?*” Five grantees indicated that they had issues with student attendance as a result of COVID. Specifically, grantees reported the quarantining effect on student program attendance and one grantee mentioned its negative impact on student enrollment.

Collaboration with Low-Performing Schools

As stated in the legislation, “*priority consideration shall be given to applications demonstrating models that focus services and programs in schools that are identified as low-performing pursuant to G.S. 115C-105.37.*”⁶ Given the legislative intent that non-profit organizations awarded grants work in close collaboration with low-performing schools in improving outcomes for at-risk students, grantees were required to report the number of low-performing schools they plan to serve using ELISS funding. Overall, ELISS grantees reported planning to serve a total of 60 low-performing schools.

- 2 of 19 grantees (11%) reported they served 0 low-performing schools.
- 5 of 19 grantees (26%) reported serving 1 low-performing school.
- 5 of 19 grantees (26%) reported serving 2-3 low-performing schools.
- 3 of 19 grantees (16%) reported serving 4-5 low-performing schools.
- 4 of 19 grantees (21%) reported they served 6-8 low-performing schools.

In addition to low-performing, grantees are also serving and/or planning to serve schools identified as Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)⁷, Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)⁸, and/or Title I⁹. The different school types are shown in Table 6.

⁶ Low-performing schools are those that receive a school performance grade of D or F and a school growth score of met expected growth or not met expected growth.

⁷ Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools (CSI Schools): Schools that are in the bottom 5 percent of Title I schools for all students, or have a graduation rate of 67 percent or lower. (Source: https://edtrust.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/ESSA_FactSheet__Overview_Hyperlink.pdf)

⁸ Targeted Support and Improvement Schools (TSI Schools): Schools that are “consistently underperforming” for any group of students, as defined by the state. (Source: https://edtrust.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/ESSA_FactSheet__Overview_Hyperlink.pdf)

⁹ Title I Schools: Title I, Part A (Title I) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESEA) provides financial assistance to local educational agencies for children from low-income families to help ensure that all children meet challenging state academic standards. (Source: <https://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=158>)



Table 6. Types and Numbers of Schools Grantees Plan to Serve

	# Grantees Planning to Serve CSI Schools	# Grantees Planning to Serve TSI schools	# Grantees Planning to Serve Title I Schools	# Grantees Planning to Serve Low-performing Schools
0 Schools Served	12 of 19 (63%)	1 of 19 (5%)	1 of 19 (5%)	2 of 19 (11%)
1 School Served	4 of 19 (21%)	1 of 19 (5%)	1 of 19 (5%)	5 of 19 (26%)
2-3 Schools Served	2 of 19 (11%)	6 of 19 (32%)	4 of 19 (21%)	5 of 19 (26%)
4-5 Schools Served	1 of 19 (5%)	7 of 19 (37%)	6 of 19 (32%)	3 of 19 (16%)
6-8 Schools Served	0	1 of 19 (5%)	3 of 19 (16%)	4 of 19 (21%)
9+ Schools Served	0	3 of 19 (16%)	4 of 19 (21%)	0

Leveraging of Community-Based Resources

The ELISS grantees indicated various community-based partners, such as school systems, food banks, parks and recreation programs, churches, learning centers, credit unions, colleges, and museums. Some examples of resources/services provided include mentoring, enrichment, snacks, nutrition programs, dental health, academic learning, employment coaching, books, and field trips.

Matching Funds

The ELISS legislation stated,

A grant participant shall provide certification to the Department of Public Instruction that the grants received under the program shall be matched on the basis of three dollars (\$3.00) in grant funds for every one dollar (\$1.00) in non-grant funds. Matching funds shall not include State funds.

All grantees provided certification that both cash and in-kind matching funds would be secured.

Summary of End-of-Grant Subgrantee Evaluation Planning

With any grant program, it is essential that grantees evaluate and report on program impact. As specified in the legislation, ELISS grantees are required to submit evaluation reports at the end of the grant period. Thus, during on-boarding training, grantees were notified that an *End-of-Grant Subgrantee Report* will be due in the CCIP system on or before September 30 (in 2022 for Year 1 and in 2023 for Year 2). To ensure that grantees have revisited and operationalized the data collection plans they proposed as part of the grant application process, grantees were asked to indicate the various data/methods they plan to use to assess their ELISS-funded program's impact on participating students. Their plans are described below.

Stakeholder Perception Data

In terms of stakeholders' perception regarding the impact of ELISS-funded programming on participants, the majority of grantees indicated that they plan to utilize student or parent surveys (13 grantees), two plan to survey staff/principals/teachers and two plan to conduct interviews with students, parents, or staff. However, two grantees indicated that they were not yet sure what measures they will plan to use to collect stakeholder perception data.



Student Performance Outcome Data

In terms of student performance outcome data, grantees indicated the following:

- 16 of 19 grantees (84%) plan to use academic reading outcome data.
- 15 of 19 grantees (79%) plan to use academic math outcome data.
- 16 of 19 grantees (84%) plan to use behavioral outcome data.
- 12 of 19 grantees (63%) plan to use social emotional outcome data.
- 5 of 19 grantees (26%) plan to use attendance data.

Of the 19 grantees, 10 plan to analyze their data internally, while 9 intend to use an external evaluator. Of those grantees planning to use an external evaluator, 3 have not yet identified the evaluator.

III. Summary of ELISS Program Services To-Date

In summary, during the first half of the 2021-22 school year, the ELISS grantees that were operational at the time of reporting provided:

- 384 students with afterschool opportunities (averaging 40 contact hours per student),
- 1,902 students with Tier II and III ISS services (averaging 16 hours of services received per student), and
- over 13,658 students with ELISS-funded Tier I, as needed, services.

Furthermore, it is anticipated that at the end of the two-year ELISS grant-funded period (i.e., by September 2023), that grantees will provide support to a total of:

- 192 schools across 15 counties,
- 1,305 students with Extended Learning (EL) programming,
- 2,890 students with Tier II and/or Tier III Integrated Student Support (ISS) services, and
- over 20,000 students with ELISS-funded Tier I services.



Appendix

ELISS Application Review Rubric

1. COLLABORATIVE FOCUS ON AT-RISK STUDENTS (FA-6)

(Rate this section from 1-20 using the scoring guide below. 20 is the highest possible score.)

A collaborative focus on at-risk students will reflect: a) the types of targeted at-risk students (at-risk factor(s), grade level, etc.), including those students whose learning has been negatively affected by COVID-19 impacts, as well as, schools (including low-performing) and district(s) to be served; b) the specific needs of at-risk students, including those students whose learning has been negatively affected by COVID-19 impacts; c) the gaps collaborating school(s) and district(s) have in meeting the needs of targeted at-risk students; and d) the collaboration with proposed partnering school principal(s), including roles and responsibilities.				
Dimensions		Leading (20-15 points)	Developing (14-7 points)	Lacking (6-1 points)
Applicant provides:	a. Identification of targeted group(s) of at-risk students¹⁰ (including those negatively impacted by COVID-19, school(s) (including low-performing¹¹) and districts to be served	Clear description of the at-risk students (including those negatively impacted by COVID-19), the school(s) (including low-performing), and district(s) the program proposes to serve.	General or somewhat clear description of the at-risk students (including those negatively impacted by COVID-19), the school(s) (including low-performing), and district(s) the program proposes to serve.	Incomplete or vague description of which students or school(s) the program proposes to serve.
	b. Use of data to demonstrate the specific needs of the targeted students to be served	Well-organized summary of relevant data that clearly demonstrates the needs of the at-risk students (including those negatively affected by COVID-19 impacts) identified to be served.	Somewhat clear summary of data that mostly demonstrates the needs of the at-risk students (including those negatively affected by COVID-19 impacts) identified to be served.	Incomplete summary of data that does not sufficiently demonstrate the needs of the at-risk students identified to be served.
	c. Gaps collaborating school(s) and district(s) have in meeting needs of targeted at-risk students	Clear and concrete summary of the gaps identified collaborating school(s) and district(s) have in meeting the needs of the targeted at-risk students (including mitigating the effects of COVID-19 impacts).	General or somewhat clear summary of the gaps identified collaborating school(s) and district(s) have in meeting the needs of the targeted at-risk students (including mitigating the effects of COVID-19 impacts).	Incomplete or confusing summary of the gaps identified collaborating school(s) and district(s) have in meeting the needs of the targeted at-risk students.
	d. Collaboration with proposed partnering school principal(s), including roles and responsibilities	Clear description of how the lead organization will collaborate with school principal(s), including identifying roles and responsibilities to meet the needs of targeted students, school(s) and district(s).	General or somewhat clear description of how the lead organization will collaborate with school principal(s), including identifying roles and responsibilities to meet the needs of targeted students, school(s) and district(s).	Vague description of how the lead organization will collaborate with school principal(s), to meet the needs of targeted students, school(s) and district(s).

¹⁰ Programs must serve one or more of the following student groups: 1) at-risk students not performing at grade level as demonstrated by statewide assessments, or not on track to meet year-end expectations, as demonstrated by existing indicators, including teacher identification 2) students at-risk of dropout, and/or 3) students at-risk of school displacement due to suspension or expulsion as a result of anti-social behaviors.

¹¹ Low-performing schools are those that receive a school performance grade of D or F and a school growth score of “met expected growth” or “not met expected growth” as defined by § 115C-85.15. (§ 115C-105.37).



2. ARTICULATION OF PROGRAM MODEL (FA-7)

(Rate this section from 1-25 using the scoring guide below. 25 is the highest possible score.)

The applicant should provide well-developed responses that clearly describe: a) the program model, its key components, including strategies to mitigate the negative effects of COVID-19 impacts on learning, and alignment to the needs of targeted students; b) the organization’s past experience in implementing the model described in “a.” and what was learned from past experience about how to implement the model for at-risk students; c) how proposed students to be served will be invited to participate in the program, and how proposed activities/services support targeted students’ success in their regular academic program; d) how the program will facilitate meaningful family and community engagement in supporting targeted students’ academic behaviors and achievement; and e) how the program model proposed is likely to benefit (including mitigating negative effects of COVID-19 impacts on learning) the targeted students.				
Dimensions		Leading (25-19 points)	Developing (18-9 points)	Lacking (8-1 points)
Applicant provides:	a. Overall model, key components (including strategies to mitigate the negative effects of COVID-19), and the alignment to the needs of targeted at-risk students	Detailed description of the overall program model, key components (including strategies to mitigate the negative effects of COVID-19 impacts on learning) with specific alignment to the needs of targeted at-risk students.	Somewhat detailed description of the overall program model, key components (including strategies to mitigate the negative effects of COVID-19 impacts on learning) with specific alignment to the needs of targeted at-risk students.	Vague, incomplete, or confusing description of the program model with little or no alignment to the needs of targeted at-risk students.
	b. Organization’s past experience in implementing the model described	Clear summary of the organization’s past experience in implementing the proposed model (described in “a.”), including lessons learned about implementing the model for at-risk students.	General summary of the organization’s past experience in implementing the proposed model (described in “a.”), including lessons learned about implementing the model for at-risk students.	Vague or confusing summary of the organization’s past experience in implementing the proposed model or missing lessons learned about implementing the model for at-risk students.
	c. How identified students to be served will be invited to participate in the program, and how proposed activities/services support those students’ success in their regular academic program	Clear description of how identified students to be served will be invited to participate in the program, and how the proposed activities/services support those students’ success in their regular academic program.	Somewhat clear description of how identified students to be served will be invited to participate in the program, and how the proposed activities/services support those students’ success in their regular academic program.	Incomplete or confusing description of how identified students will be invited to participate in the program, and how the proposed activities/services support students’ success in their regular academic program.
	d. Description of how the program will facilitate meaningful family and community engagement in supporting students’ academic behaviors and achievement	Clear description of how the program will facilitate meaningful family and community engagement in support of positive academic behaviors and student achievement.	General or somewhat clear description of how the program will facilitate meaningful family and community engagement in support of positive academic behaviors and student achievement.	Incomplete or confusing description of how the program will facilitate meaningful family and community engagement (may also lack a focus on support for the academic needs of students).
	e. How the program model proposed is likely to benefit (including mitigating negative effects of COVID-19 impacts on learning) the targeted students	Clear rationale behind key aspects of the program model as to how the program will benefit the at-risk students to be served (including mitigating the negative effects of COVID-19 impacts on learning).	General, but somewhat evident rationale behind key aspects of the program model as to how the program will benefit the at-risk students to be served (including mitigating the negative effects of COVID-19 impacts on learning).	Vague or confusing rationale behind key aspects of the program model.



3. OPERATIONAL CAPACITY (FA-9)

(Rate this section from 1-25 using the scoring guide below. 25 is the highest possible score.)

The applicant provides clear evidence for capacity to implement the program including: a) organizational history and prior funding sources for programs serving at-risk students; b) key leaders' experience and proposed staffing; c) agreement with school(s) and district(s) on commitment of resources for program (e.g., extended learning time facilities, space/time in the school day for Integrated Student Support meetings with students, technology in place for student use); d) how community-based resources have been identified and will be leveraged to expand student access to learning activities and, academic and behavioral supports; and e) how collaborations and partnerships with other organizations will lead to sustaining the program (i.e., secure funding, shared resources, long-term partnerships) to support the needs of at-risk students beyond the grant period.				
Dimensions		Leading (25-19 points)	Developing (18-9 points)	Lacking (8-1 points)
Applicant provides:	a. Organizational history and prior funding sources for programs serving at-risk students	Clear and detailed description with supporting evidence of the organization's history of successfully serving at-risk students and the sources of funding for such programs.	Somewhat detailed description with supporting evidence of the organization's history of successfully serving at-risk students and the sources of funding for such programs.	Limited or incomplete description of the organization's history of successfully serving at-risk students, but may be missing information (e.g., evidence of success, sources of funding).
	b. Key leaders' experience and proposed staffing	Detailed staffing plan that includes: description of the roles of key personnel and expected qualifications; proposed staffing (including credentialed/non-credentialed staff); and expected staff-to-student ratios.	Somewhat detailed staffing plan that includes: description of the roles of key personnel and expected qualifications; proposed staffing (including credentialed/non-credentialed staff); and expected staff-to-student ratios.	Limited or incomplete staffing plan (e.g., may be missing information about roles of key personnel and expected qualifications; credentialed/non-credentialed staff; or expected staff-to-student ratios).
	c. Commitment by school(s) and district(s) of resources for program	Detailed description of the commitment by school(s) and district(s) served of resources for the program (e.g., extended learning time facilities, space/time in the school day for Integrated Student Supports activities with students, technology for students) in order to meet the needs of students.	General description of the commitment by school(s) and district(s) served of resources for the program (e.g., extended learning time facilities, space/time in the school day for Integrated Student Support meetings with students, technology in place for student use) in order to meet the needs of students.	Incomplete or vague description of the commitment by school(s) and district(s) served of resources for the program.
	d. How community-based resources have been identified and will be leveraged to expand student access to learning activities and, academic and behavioral supports	Clear and convincing description of how the program will identify and leverage community-based resources to expand student access to learning activities and, academic and behavioral supports.	Somewhat clear description of how the program will identify and leverage community-based resources to expand student access to learning activities and, academic and behavioral supports.	Incomplete or vague description of how community-based resources will be identified and leveraged to expand student access to learning activities and, academic and behavioral supports.
	e. How collaborations and partnerships with other organizations will lead to sustaining the program	Clear and convincing description as to how collaborations and partnerships with other organizations will lead to sustaining the program beyond the grant.	Somewhat clear description as to how collaborations and partnerships with other organizations will lead to sustaining the program beyond the grant.	Limited or vague description as to how collaborations and partnerships with other organizations will lead to sustaining the program beyond the grant.



4. EVALUATION CAPACITY (FA-10)

(Rate this section from 1-15 using the scoring guide below. 15 is the highest possible score.)

The applicant demonstrates capacity for conducting formative and summative evaluation of the program by describing: a) key student outcomes and associated performance measures that align with the proposed program model.; b) the organizational plan for collecting, analyzing, and reporting participation and outcome data on students served (including assurances that the organization has access to the data described); and c) organizational capacity (internal or external) for completing the required outcome reporting, as well as, using data for continuous program improvement.				
Dimensions		Leading (15-11)	Developing (10-6)	Lacking (5-1)
Applicant provides:	a. Key student outcomes and associated performance measures that align with the proposed program model	Clear and specific articulation of student performance measures—aligned with program goals—that will be used to monitor student outcomes.	Somewhat clear articulation of student performance measures—aligned with program goals—that will be used to monitor student outcomes.	Incomplete, confusing, or unrealistic description of student performance measures.
	b. Organizational plan for collecting, analyzing, and reporting participation and outcome data on students served	Clear and specific organizational plan for collecting, analyzing, and reporting participation and outcome data on students served (including assurances that the organization has access to the data described).	General description for collecting, analyzing, and reporting participation and outcome data on students served (including assurances that the organization has access to the data described).	Incomplete or confusing description for collecting, analyzing, and reporting participation and outcome data on students served.
	c. Organizational capacity for completing the required outcome reporting, as well as, using data for continuous program improvement	Clear and convincing description of organizational capacity (internal or external) for completing the required outcome reporting, as well as, using data for continuous program improvement.	Somewhat clear or general description of organizational capacity (internal or external) for completing the required outcome reporting, as well as, using data for continuous program improvement.	Incomplete or missing description of organizational capacity for completing the required outcome reporting, and using data for continuous program improvement.

5. BUDGET NARRATIVE AND ALIGNMENT (FA-11)

(Rate this section from 1-10 using the scoring guide below. 10 is the highest possible score.)

The applicant provides a budget narrative that describes: a) how costs align to proposed program components, reflecting the necessity and reasonableness of costs; and b) any cost-sharing or resource-sharing arrangements between partnering districts/schools and applicant organization(s).				
Dimensions		Leading (10-8 points)	Developing (7-4 points)	Lacking (3-1 points)
Applicant provides:	a. Budget narrative aligns costs to proposed program, reflecting necessity and reasonableness of costs	Detailed budget narrative that clearly aligns costs to services, activities, staffing, and administration proposed for the program, reflecting the necessity and reasonableness of costs.	Budget narrative is general and reflects alignment as well as necessity and reasonableness of costs for proposed services, activities, staffing, and administration.	Budget narrative lacks sufficient detail to ascertain whether costs are necessary, reasonable, or well-aligned for/to proposed program services, activities, staffing, or administration.
	b. Cost-sharing or resource-sharing arrangements between partnering districts/schools and applicant organization	Detailed and convincing description of cost-sharing or resource-sharing arrangements between partnering districts/schools and applicant organization.	Somewhat detailed description of cost-sharing or resource-sharing arrangements between partnering districts/schools and applicant organization.	Incomplete or vague description of cost-sharing or resource-sharing arrangements, leaving concerns about confirmed commitments among parties.



6. POTENTIAL FOR REPLICATION (FA-12)

(Rate this section from 1-10 using the scoring guide below. 10 is the highest possible score.)

Applicant provides evidence of potential for replicability by describing the extent: a) of prior implementation of the proposed program model in the county or in the state and what is known about its impact on at-risk students; and b) to which the proposed program model has future potential for replication in other locations.				
Dimensions		Leading (10-8 points)	Developing (7-4 points)	Lacking (3-1 points)
Applicant provides:	a. Prior implementation of the proposed program model (in the county or state) and what is known about its impact on at-risk students	Detailed and compelling description of prior implementation of the proposed model and the resulting impact on at-risk students. Details should include formative and summative evidence, as well as lessons learned.	Somewhat detailed description of prior implementation of the proposed model and the resulting impact on at-risk students, with some supporting formative and summative evidence and lessons learned.	Vague or incomplete description of prior implementation of the proposed model and the resulting impact on at-risk students. Details lack evidence.
	b. Replicability of model in other locations	Detailed description that provides convincing justification of the likelihood that the proposed program model could be successfully replicated for at-risk students in other locations.	Provides sufficient detail to support potential that the proposed program model could be successfully replicated for at-risk students in other locations.	Proposal lacking or incomplete in the case it makes regarding the potential for successful replication of the model in other locations.

