

State of Maine
Master Score Sheet

RFP# 202412216				
21 st Century Community Learning Centers Program				
Bidder Name:		RSU 56	Franklin County Children's Task Force (RSU 09)	Franklin County Children's Task Force (RSU 10)
Proposed Cost:		\$144,994.55	\$218,400.00	\$250,000.00
Scoring Sections	Points Available			
Section I: Preliminary Information	Pass/Fail	Pass	Pass	Pass
Section II: Specifications of Work	55	53	49	49
Section III: Budget Proposal	38	35	36	32
Section IV: Priority Points	7	4	3	6
TOTAL	<u>100</u>	<u>92</u>	<u>88</u>	<u>87</u>
Bidder Name:		Pequawket Kid Charitable Association	Ellsworth Public Schools	Boys and Girls Club of Southern Maine
Proposed Cost:		\$135,000.00	\$250,000.00	\$150,000.00
Scoring Sections	Points Available			
Section I: Preliminary Information	Pass/Fail	Pass	Pass	Pass
Section II: Specifications of Work	55	48	41	43
Section III: Budget Proposal	38	32	31	29
Section IV: Priority Points	7	5	5	4
TOTAL	<u>100</u>	<u>85</u>	<u>77</u>	<u>76</u>

Bidder Name:		Lewiston Public Schools (LMS)	Lewiston Public Schools (MES)	Lewiston Public Schools (FES RVCES)
Proposed Cost:		\$109,200.00	\$175,000.00	\$218,400.00
Scoring Sections	Points Available			
Section I: Preliminary Information	Pass/Fail	Pass	Pass	Pass
Section II: Specifications of Work	55	41	40	40
Section III: Budget Proposal	38	27	27	27
Section IV: Priority Points	7	5	6	5
TOTAL	<u>100</u>	<u>73</u>	<u>73</u>	<u>72</u>
Bidder Name:		Wiscasset Public Schools		
Proposed Cost:		\$282,700.00		
Scoring Sections	Points Available			
Section I: Preliminary Information	Pass/Fail	Pass		
Section II: Specifications of Work	55	33		
Section III: Budget Proposal	38	21		
Section IV: Priority Points	7	4		
TOTAL	<u>100</u>	<u>58</u>		



**STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**

**Janet T. Mills
Governor**

**Pender Makin
Commissioner**

May 15, 2025

Ms. Joy Mahoney
RSU 56
117 Auburn Road
Peru, ME 04290

SUBJECT: Notice of Conditional Contract Award(s) under RFP # 202412216,
21st Century Community Learning Centers Program

Dear Ms. Mahoney:

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 Southern Maine
- Ellsworth Public Schools
- Franklin County Children's Task Force (RSU 09)
- Franklin County Children's Task Force (RSU 10)
- Lewiston Public Schools (FES RVCES)
- Lewiston Public Schools (LMS)
- Lewiston Public Schools (MES)
- Pequawket Kid Charitable Association
- RSU 56

The bidders listed above received the evaluation team's highest ranking(s). The Department will be contacting the aforementioned bidders 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, Office of State Procurement Services [formerly the Division of Purchases], Chapter 120, § (2) (2).



**STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**

**Janet T. Mills
Governor**

**Pender Makin
Commissioner**

May 15, 2025

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

SUBJECT: Notice of Conditional Contract Award(s) under RFP # 202412216,
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 Southern Maine
- Ellsworth Public Schools
- Franklin County Children's Task Force (RSU 09)
- Franklin County Children's Task Force (RSU 10)
- Lewiston Public Schools (FES RVCES)
- Lewiston Public Schools (LMS)
- Lewiston Public Schools (MES)
- Pequawket Kid Charitable Association
- RSU 56

The bidders listed above received the evaluation team's highest ranking(s). The Department will be contacting the aforementioned bidders 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, Office of State Procurement Services [formerly the Division of Purchases], Chapter 120, § (2) (2).



**STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**

**Janet T. Mills
Governor**

**Pender Makin
Commissioner**

May 15, 2025

Mr. Jeffery Walburger
Pequawket Kid Charitable Association
25 Molly Ockett Drive
Fryeburg, ME 04037

SUBJECT: Notice of Conditional Contract Award(s) under RFP # 202412216,
21st Century Community Learning Centers Program

Dear Mr. Walburger:

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 Southern Maine
- Ellsworth Public Schools
- Franklin County Children's Task Force (RSU 09)
- Franklin County Children's Task Force (RSU 10)
- Lewiston Public Schools (FES RVCES)
- Lewiston Public Schools (LMS)
- Lewiston Public Schools (MES)
- Pequawket Kid Charitable Association
- RSU 56

The bidders listed above received the evaluation team's highest ranking(s). The Department will be contacting the aforementioned bidders 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, Office of State Procurement Services [formerly the Division of Purchases], Chapter 120, § (2) (2).



**STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**

**Janet T. Mills
Governor**

**Pender Makin
Commissioner**

May 15, 2025

Ms. Leigh Elliot
Ellsworth Public Schools
11 Avery Lange
Ellsworth, ME 04605

SUBJECT: Notice of Conditional Contract Award(s) under RFP # 202412216,
21st Century Community Learning Centers Program

Dear Ms. Elliot:

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 Southern Maine
- Ellsworth Public Schools
- Franklin County Children's Task Force (RSU 09)
- Franklin County Children's Task Force (RSU 10)
- Lewiston Public Schools (FES RVCES)
- Lewiston Public Schools (LMS)
- Lewiston Public Schools (MES)
- Pequawket Kid Charitable Association
- RSU 56

The bidders listed above received the evaluation team's highest ranking(s). The Department will be contacting the aforementioned bidders 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, Office of State Procurement Services [formerly the Division of Purchases], Chapter 120, § (2) (2).



**STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**

**Janet T. Mills
Governor**

**Pender Makin
Commissioner**

May 15, 2025

Mr. Brian Elowe
Boys & Girls Club of Southern Maine
277 Cumberland Avenue
Portland, ME 04101

SUBJECT: Notice of Conditional Contract Award(s) under RFP # 202412216,
21st Century Community Learning Centers Program

Dear Mr. Elowe:

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 Southern Maine
- Ellsworth Public Schools
- Franklin County Children's Task Force (RSU 09)
- Franklin County Children's Task Force (RSU 10)
- Lewiston Public Schools (FES RVCES)
- Lewiston Public Schools (LMS)
- Lewiston Public Schools (MES)
- Pequawket Kid Charitable Association
- RSU 56

The bidders listed above received the evaluation team's highest ranking(s). The Department will be contacting the aforementioned bidders 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, Office of State Procurement Services [formerly the Division of Purchases], Chapter 120, § (2) (2).



**STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**

**Janet T. Mills
Governor**

**Pender Makin
Commissioner**

May 15, 2025

Ms. Gretchen Pleasant
Lewiston Public Schools
36 Oak Street
Lewiston, ME 04240

SUBJECT: Notice of Conditional Contract Award(s) under RFP # 202412216,
21st Century Community Learning Centers Program

Dear Ms. Pleasant:

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 Southern Maine
- Ellsworth Public Schools
- Franklin County Children's Task Force (RSU 09)
- Franklin County Children's Task Force (RSU 10)
- Lewiston Public Schools (FES RVCES)
- Lewiston Public Schools (LMS)
- Lewiston Public Schools (MES)
- Pequawket Kid Charitable Association
- RSU 56

The bidders listed above received the evaluation team's highest ranking(s). The Department will be contacting the aforementioned bidders 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, Office of State Procurement Services [formerly the Division of Purchases], Chapter 120, § (2) (2).



**STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**

**Janet T. Mills
Governor**

**Pender Makin
Commissioner**

May 15, 2025

Ms. Cynthia Young
Wiscasset Public Schools
225 Gardiner Road
Wiscasset, ME 04578

SUBJECT: Notice of Conditional Contract Award(s) under RFP # 202412216,
21st Century Community Learning Centers Program

Dear Ms. Young:

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 Southern Maine
- Ellsworth Public Schools
- Franklin County Children's Task Force (RSU 09)
- Franklin County Children's Task Force (RSU 10)
- Lewiston Public Schools (FES RVCES)
- Lewiston Public Schools (LMS)
- Lewiston Public Schools (MES)
- Pequawket Kid Charitable Association
- RSU 56

The bidders listed above received the evaluation team's highest ranking(s). The Department will be contacting the aforementioned bidders 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, Office of State Procurement Services [formerly the Division of Purchases], Chapter 120, § (2) (2).

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

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: RSU 56
DATE: 04/30/25

DEPARTMENT NAME: Education
NAME OF RFP COORDINATOR: Travis Doughty
NAMES OF EVALUATORS: Lindsay Barrett, Renee Felini, Sarah Ghazi-Jordan

POINT SUMMARY

Section I. General Information (Pass/Fail)

Required Item	Pass	Fail	Comments
1. Cover Sheet	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
2. Responsible Bidder 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	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 H	3	3
Staffing ratios alignment with the recommended instructor to student ratios outlined in Appendix H	2	2
Elements of high-quality programming: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li style="width: 50%;">• Linkages to School Day <li style="width: 50%;">• Student-Driven Programming <li style="width: 50%;">• Strong Instructional Leadership <li style="width: 50%;">• Regular Attendees <li style="width: 50%;">• Safe and Appropriate Environment 	5	5

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

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: RSU 56
DATE: 04/30/25

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”: <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
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)		53

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
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

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

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: RSU 56
DATE: 04/30/25

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	12
Capacity for Success and Sustainability (Maximum 13 Points)		
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)		35

Section IV. Priority Points (7 Total Points)

Priority Points (Maximum 7 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded								
<u>New or Expanded Services:</u>										
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 33%;">Proposal Type</td> <td style="width: 33%;">Companion Proposal</td> <td style="width: 33%;">New or Expansion Proposal</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Priority Points</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> </tr> </table>	Proposal Type	Companion Proposal	New or Expansion Proposal	Priority Points	0	1	1	0		
Proposal Type	Companion Proposal	New or Expansion Proposal								
Priority Points	0	1								
<u>School and Community Partnership:</u>										
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 33%;">Partnership including one or more SAUs that receive Title I, Part A funds</td> <td style="width: 33%;">No</td> <td style="width: 33%;">Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Priority Points</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> </tr> </table>	Partnership including one or more SAUs that receive Title I, Part A funds	No	Yes	Priority Points	0	2	2	2		
Partnership including one or more SAUs that receive Title I, Part A funds	No	Yes								
Priority Points	0	2								
<u>ESEA Accountability Status:</u>										
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 33%;">ESEA accountability status of the school(s) included within the application</td> <td style="width: 16.5%;">No school(s) eligible for “Tier 1”, “Tier 2”, or “Tier 3” support</td> <td style="width: 16.5%;">One or more schools eligible for “Tier 1” or “Tier 2” support</td> <td style="width: 33%;">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: 33%;">Level of evidence within the application</td> <td style="width: 16.5%;">No Evidence</td> <td style="width: 16.5%;">Moderate Evidence</td> <td style="width: 33%;">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	1
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)		92								

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

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: RSU 56
DATE: 04/30/25

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 planning process for the proposal occurred over an 11-month period and included several different individuals. While the review team would've liked to have more information on the organizations that everyone involved in the planning process represented, it did appear that the school district and lead partner organizations were represented during the planning process. The review team also appreciated the fact that a draft proposal was shared with the school board for discussion and feedback prior to official submission.</p> <p>The needs assessment presented provided a good mix of community and school-level data. However, the sources from which data has been gathered are not always cited in the bidder's response. The review team would've liked a more consistent approach here. With this being a companion proposal, it was positive to see data on the extent to which students are making gains through the current program. This sort of evidence helps to build justification for the continuation of services. The narrative provided here was strong in terms of how the proposed program would meet the identified needs of the students and families attending the 21st CCLC program.</p> <p>The overall program design is well aligned with program goals, incorporating elements of student voice and choice and trauma-informed practices. The bidder has a track record of increasing participation in the existing program, citing concrete strategies that have worked well. The program's student enrollment and RLP goals appear to meet the requirements of the RFP. The program serves a relatively large percentage of the overall school population, which further demonstrates how integrated into the school the program is. The proposed program schedule meets the minimum requirements for school year and summer programming outlined within the RFP, with school year program hours slightly above the minimum. The proposed staff-to-student ratios fall within the requirements of the RFP. The review team appreciated the confirmation that academic tutoring would be facilitated by licensed content-area teachers. It is noted that the program director has an office within the school and serves on the school's PBIS and Grade-level Learning Teams. This was a strong connection that the review team appreciated.</p> <p>In Appendix D of the proposal, the bidder provided strong outcomes with reasonable plans for achieving them. The proposed strategies and activities are well-developed and specific, sometimes even including information on the actual instructors who will be carrying out certain program activities. The review team did question, however, the family participation goals. They are noted as seeming a bit low but could be realistic in relation to the population being served within the proposal.</p> <p>The bidder's response around program management indicated that the program director would be serving a dual role as a site coordinator. The requirements and qualifications mentioned for the program director appear reasonable in relation to the requirements of the role. The review team appreciated that the school intervention specialist and school principal meet with program director weekly. It is also noted that RSU 56 encourages teachers to help staff the program by offering them their standard contractual rate for after school time. Planned professional development will be co-located at the school building, with Community Concepts being heavily involved in staff training around trauma-informed practices. There is evidence of strong systems in place for data collection and analysis. RSU 56 also provides transportation to students during both the school year and summer. The narrative provided around the use of volunteers was strong and included staff above and beyond those needed for the core function of the program.</p> <p>In terms of program evaluation, the bidder leverages a mix of qualitative and quantitative measures and data. Things like program assessments, focus groups, meetings, and survey information are used to inform program services and the continuous improvement process. The bidder notes that current work has helped the school move from "Teir 3" status to "Tier 2" status within the ESEA Accountability System, demonstrating that current interventions are helping raise student achievement. The roles, responsibilities, and timeline around program evaluation were clearly articulated within the proposal. The review team appreciated that the program staff were involved in the program evaluation work and gaining input around improvement efforts. The bidder also indicates plans to widely disseminate information around program evaluation to key stakeholders.</p>		

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

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: RSU 56
DATE: 04/30/25

Section III. Budget Proposal	Points Possible: 38	Score: <u>35</u>
<p>Evaluation Team Comments:</p> <p>The budget narrative seems to align well with the content of the budget forms and the proposed outcomes for the program. The bidder's response included a cost per RLP student of \$2,636.26, which falls within the allowable range of the RFP. The budget narrative does not specify whether program fees will be charged to participants. The review team did not get the impression that there was an intent to charge program fees and notes that this seemed like an oversight by the bidder. It would have been nice to have this clarified within the budget narrative. The bidder's narrative specifies other funds that will be tapped into to support programming, such as Title I funds to support summer programming.</p> <p>The budget forms indicate that RSU 56 contributes 55% of the total transportation costs for the program, which meets and exceeds the requirements of the RFP. The review team appreciated the level of specificity for in-kind partner contributions. The team also appreciated seeing the level of specificity throughout the entirety of proposed costs included in the budget, particularly on Form 005. The forms presented demonstrate a strong understanding of costs necessary to carry out a successful program.</p> <p>Under program sustainability, the program advisory board is made up of a good mix of already identified school and community professionals. A preliminary sustainability plan appears to already be in place, with the bidder's response speaking to leveraging existing partnerships to support the long-term viability of the program. However, the review team would have liked a more clear and quantifiable set of action steps for transitioning the funding of the program from the 21st CCLC grant to other sources. The roles of both RSU 56 and Community Concepts are very clearly delineated within the narrative provided.</p>		
Section IV. Priority Points	Points Possible: 7	Score: <u>4</u>
<p>Evaluation Team Comments:</p> <p>This is a companion proposal.</p> <p>The proposal does include a school and community partnership consisting of at least one school administrative unit that receives Title I funds under the ESEA.</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 results of the Maine Integrated Youth Health Survey that indicated students in RSU 56 are facing issues of drug use, poor health decisions, and mental health concerns. Additional data was provided to indicate that there is a high dropout risk for students in Oxford County.</p>		

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

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: Franklin County Children’s Task Force (RSU 09)
DATE: 05/01/25

DEPARTMENT NAME: Education
NAME OF RFP COORDINATOR: Travis Doughty
NAMES OF EVALUATORS: Deborah Gilmer, Jessica McPhail, Melinda Luders

POINT SUMMARY

Section I. General Information (Pass/Fail)

Required Item	Pass	Fail	Comments
1. Cover Sheet	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
2. Responsible Bidder 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	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 H	3	3
Staffing ratios alignment with the recommended instructor to student ratios outlined in Appendix H	2	2
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

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

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: Franklin County Children’s Task Force (RSU 09)
DATE: 05/01/25

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	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)		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	3
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

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

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: Franklin County Children’s Task Force (RSU 09)
DATE: 05/01/25

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	12
Capacity for Success and Sustainability (Maximum 13 Points)		
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	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>New or Expanded Services:</u>				1	0
Proposal Type	Companion Proposal	New or Expansion Proposal			
Priority Points	0	1			
<u>School and Community Partnership:</u>				2	2
Partnership including one or more SAUs that receive Title I, Part A funds	No	Yes			
Priority Points	0	2			
<u>ESEA Accountability Status:</u>				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>				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)					3
OFFICIAL SCORE (Max. 100 points)					88

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

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: Franklin County Children’s Task Force (RSU 09)
DATE: 05/01/25

EVALUATION TEAM NOTES

Section II. Specifications of Work to be Performed	Points Possible: 55	Score: 49
<p>Evaluation Team Comments:</p> <p>The planning process for the proposal spanned over 8 months and included various representatives from the bidder and partnering organizations. The review team appreciated that the planning process included a community forum where parents and other community members could provide valuable input into the planning for the program before the proposal was submitted.</p> <p>The needs assessment included a mix of data on both academic and social support needs of students. This is a high poverty area with limited access to transportation services and other out-of-school time programs. Community health data and high instances of students experiencing ACES were also noted within the needs assessment. The bidder’s response indicated that low-performing students would be prioritized. However, the review team would have liked to see a bit more data on the baseline performance data for students to be served. This would have provided greater context as to the academic needs of students.</p> <p>In terms of program design, the required elements have been provided and align with the goals of appendix D. The student counts for the Academy Hill program do not make sense as presented in the proposal. The total number of RLP students served (42) should not exceed the total number of students to be served at the site (37). The school year and summer operational schedules meet the requirements of the RFP but are noted as being on the lower end of the allowable range. The staff-to-student ratios provided align with the requirements of Appendix H. However, the review team would have liked to see more specific ratios for targeted academic programming that were on the lower end of the range. An ongoing partnership with UMF is noted as a strength from an instructional leadership standpoint. Programming is noted as being updated every 6 weeks or so to ensure student interest is kept. The review team liked the approach of having rotation stations for students to participate in during program time. This offers participating students a good level of autonomy and choice.</p> <p>Appendix D of the proposal included sound strategies and activities related to the various goal areas. It is noted that the idea of regular student surveys for programming feedback was a real positive. The review team noted that the academic improvement targets seemed a bit low but could be realistic for the student population being worked with. This is something that could have been made stronger by including more baseline data on students’ performance in the needs assessment portion of the proposal. The 30% student improvement rates based on teacher survey results also felt a bit low. The team also appreciated the ongoing feedback loop from parent surveys to inform program services and delivery. The overall plans around professional and staff development were strong. Collaboration and integration between the 21st CCLC program and school day program were impressive.</p> <p>For program administration, the narrative provided seemed to indicate the need to hire a program director. However, the review team questioned this for a companion proposal. It was unclear if the current program director would be leaving the program. That said, the narrative provided did indicate that the individual being hired for the position would meet the qualifications for the position. School leadership support seems strong, with weekly meetings occurring to discuss students and programming. There is also a strong emphasis of hiring staff from within each school to help staff the program. Staff professional development, while positive, did seem to be more heavily focused on student behavior and a bit less on academics. The team would’ve liked to see more of a blend of academic focus in addition to supporting the non-academic needs of students. The plans around transportation were a bit confusing, as it sounded like transportation services may not always be available for students. There were some concerns around the age group of students participating in the program and the use of community bus stops where students might have a bit of a commute to their home. The review team did appreciate the idea of helping families cover transportation costs for family events. The use of program volunteers was sound. The community has access to the Frankling County Volunteer Network, which serves as a hub for volunteer recruitment.</p> <p>The proposed plans around program evaluation included a good mix of both quantitative and qualitative data, citing things such as NWEA and Fountas and Pinnell results as well as parent surveys, focus groups, etc. The review team questioned the use of IEPs as performance measures. It was not clear how these would be used to gauge improved performance for students or the program overall. In terms of timing for evaluation work, the bidder mentions quarterly data reviews as part of the advisory board meetings. Overall plans for evaluation were strong. The bidder indicated thoughtfulness around the language used for evaluation reports such that they can be easily read and interpreted by students, families, and community stakeholders.</p>		

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

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: Franklin County Children’s Task Force (RSU 09)
DATE: 05/01/25

Section III. Budget Proposal	Points Possible: 38	Score: <u>36</u>
-------------------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------------

Evaluation Team Comments:

The proposed budget narrative notes that the cost per RLP student would not exceed the \$2,700 allowed in the RFP, but did not specify what the actual cost was based on the RLP student target. The review team calculated the actual cost per RLP student to be \$2,275 and wondered why the bidder would not have confirmed this in their narrative response. The funding requested is noted as being mostly needed to cover staff salaries and benefits, with a plethora of other in-kind contributions and other funding coming from partners. The narrative also notes that no program fees would be charged to participants.

The expenses included in the budget forms all appear to be reasonable and aligned with programming goals. The majority of program transportation costs (\$100,000) are covered by the RSU 09 school district, with minimal (\$3,000) coming from the grant. The budget was very clear and concise, leaving few questions for the review team. The additional state and private funding incorporated into the program budget really makes for a stronger overall program. The review team appreciated seeing buy-in and support from multiple organizations within the proposed budget.

In terms of sustainability, the program advisory board included a diverse group of representatives, including school administration, parents, and community members. While the review team appreciated the level of diversity, it somewhat questioned the inclusion of members from other school districts not included in the proposal. For example, it would have been great to see more representation of parents, staff, etc. from the RSU 09 school district as the lead partner for this proposal. Overall, the team recommends ensuring that advisory board members include individuals that serve as liaisons for specific partnerships. The sustainability plan provided was strong, specific, and actionable. It also appeared to build on existing partnerships and community investment. The roles and commitments of the lead partners for the proposal were adequately outlined.

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

Evaluation Team Comments:

This is a companion proposal.

The proposal does include a school and community partnership consisting of at least one school administrative unit that receives Title I funds under the ESEA.

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 high childhood poverty rates that exceed the state average as well as having the second lowest median household income by county within the state.

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

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: Franklin County Children’s Task Force (RSU 10)
DATE: 04/29/25

DEPARTMENT NAME: Education
NAME OF RFP COORDINATOR: Travis Doughty
NAMES OF EVALUATORS: Lindsay Barrett, Renee Felini, Sarah Ghazi-Jordan

POINT SUMMARY

Section I. General Information (Pass/Fail)

Required Item	Pass	Fail	Comments
1. Cover Sheet	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
2. Responsible Bidder 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 D	3	3
Staffing ratios alignment with the recommended instructor to student ratios outlined in Appendix H	2	2
Elements of high-quality programming: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li style="width: 50%;">• Linkages to School Day <li style="width: 50%;">• Student-Driven Programming <li style="width: 50%;">• Strong Instructional Leadership <li style="width: 50%;">• Regular Attendees <li style="width: 50%;">• Safe and Appropriate Environment 	5	4

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

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: Franklin County Children’s Task Force (RSU 10)
DATE: 04/29/25

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	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	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	3
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	2
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
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

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

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: Franklin County Children’s Task Force (RSU 10)
DATE: 04/29/25

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)		
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	3
Section III Total (Max. 38 points)		32

Section IV. Priority Points (7 Total Points)

Priority Points (Maximum 7 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded								
<u>New or Expanded Services:</u>										
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 33%;">Proposal Type</td> <td style="width: 33%;">Companion Proposal</td> <td style="width: 33%;">New or Expansion Proposal</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Priority Points</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> </tr> </table>	Proposal Type	Companion Proposal	New or Expansion Proposal	Priority Points	0	1	1	1		
Proposal Type	Companion Proposal	New or Expansion Proposal								
Priority Points	0	1								
<u>School and Community Partnership:</u>										
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 33%;">Partnership including one or more SAUs that receive Title I, Part A funds</td> <td style="width: 33%;">No</td> <td style="width: 33%;">Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Priority Points</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> </tr> </table>	Partnership including one or more SAUs that receive Title I, Part A funds	No	Yes	Priority Points	0	2	2	2		
Partnership including one or more SAUs that receive Title I, Part A funds	No	Yes								
Priority Points	0	2								
<u>ESEA Accountability Status:</u>										
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 33%;">ESEA accountability status of the school(s) included within the application</td> <td style="width: 16.5%;">No school(s) eligible for “Tier 1”, “Tier 2”, or “Tier 3” support</td> <td style="width: 16.5%;">One or more schools eligible for “Tier 1” or “Tier 2” support</td> <td style="width: 34%;">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	2
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: 33%;">Level of evidence within the application</td> <td style="width: 16.5%;">No Evidence</td> <td style="width: 16.5%;">Moderate Evidence</td> <td style="width: 34%;">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	1
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)		6								
OFFICIAL SCORE (Max. 100 points)		87								

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

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: Franklin County Children’s Task Force (RSU 10)
DATE: 04/29/25

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 bidder’s planning process to develop the proposal was notable and proactive. Planning began in June of 2024 and included many meetings and work sessions. Meetings are noted as being robust, building on existing partnerships and programming. The meetings and planning sessions also included adequate representation from both the bidding organization and its partners.</p> <p>The bidder’s needs assessment leveraged a good mix of existing county and community data to support the need for a local 21st CCLC program. The needs assessment is, however, noted as citing mostly community data and metrics (poverty levels, social risk factors, etc.). The review team questioned the seeming lack of academic data in this portion of the proposal. This felt like a bit of a misstep on the part of the bidder, given how easily academic achievement data from the partnering school district could have further supported the need for a local 21st CCLC program.</p> <p>The range and types of programming presented appear to align with the goals of Appendix D. The review team appreciated the bidder’s attention to parent engagement, student voice and choice, and addressing of transportation barriers for families. The overall students to be served and RLP students served appear adequate and in alignment with the requirements of the RFP. That said, the review team did note a few discrepancies with the grade levels to be served within the proposal. Some areas of the proposal noted Kindergarten being the starting grade level, while others noted programming for Pre-K students. School year and summer operational schedules align with the requirements of the RFP. While summer programming meets the minimum requirements set forth in the RFP, it is noted that school year programming is well beyond the minimum requirement. The proposed staff-to-student ratios are also in alignment with the RFP requirements. The connection to the school day program included a lot of communication from the bidding organization. However, the communication back from the schools seemed somewhat limited. It wasn’t entirely clear to the review team what, beyond academic assessment data, would be shared from the partnering schools. The review team felt this portion of the proposal could have been made stronger by including more information on how the program would attract and retain enrolled students to reach regular attendee status.</p> <p>Within Appendix D of the proposal, the strategies and activities related to academic improvement note a good deal of collaboration with classroom teachers. The review team did have some challenges, however, in discerning the extent to which academic goals were realistic or achievable. Given that no specific academic data was provided earlier in the needs assessment portion of the proposal, the team questioned whether the proposed academic outcomes were both rigorous and realistic for the student population in question. The remaining strategies, activities, and outcomes appear well developed. The review team, in particular, appreciated the detailed responses and emphasis on parent and family engagement strategies.</p> <p>In relation to program management, the bidding organization appears to not yet have someone hired for the program director role. The desired qualifications for the program director position, however, appear adequate for the scope of the position. The review team would have appreciated some additional details on the buy-in and support from school day leadership to support the program. The narrative presented here often didn’t specify <i>how</i> the work would be done. The bidder’s plans for using volunteers was well-developed. The program would have access to the Franklin County Volunteer Network to secure volunteers to help aid in the delivery of program activities.</p> <p>The bidder’s evaluation work appears to include a mix of both qualitative and quantitative measures. For example, data on things like observations, surveys, student assessments, student learning objectives, etc. are noted as being incorporated into the evaluation process. The program evaluation plan is noted as aligning with the requirements of the RFP and included a specific schedule for different milestones that would be completed throughout the year. The bidder’s response around how the results of evaluations would be used to strengthen the program were somewhat vague and could have been stronger.</p>		

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

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: Franklin County Children’s Task Force (RSU 10)
DATE: 04/29/25

Section III. Budget Proposal	Points Possible: 38	Score: <u>32</u>
-------------------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------------

Evaluation Team Comments:

The proposed budget narrative had a reasonable alignment to the goals presented in Appendix D. The bidder specified that the cost per RLP student would not exceed \$2,700. However, the exact cost per RLP student was not presented within the budget narrative. The review team calculated this figure to be \$2,688.17 per RLP student. The budget narrative notes that no fees will be charged, and that programming will be made available to students and families at no cost. The information provided about in-kind funding and partner contributions was minimal. The review team would have appreciated more information about the various partner contributions within the budget narrative.

Withing the budget forms, proposal met and exceeded the 35% transportation contribution required of the partnering school district. However, the review team had several questions due to conflicting information about transportation figures and percentages between school year and summer programs. On budget Form 005, the review team questioned what the staff travel costs would be supporting. The team thought it was odd that staff would be reimbursed to travel “to and from program” as well as for “supply drop off”. It was not clear what staff would actually be doing and/or paid for with these funds.

In terms of sustainability, the program advisory board included a good mix of organization, school district, and community partner representatives. However, it is noted that the Superintendent of the partnering school district is not included on the advisory board. This felt like a notable shortfall of the proposal. The review team questioned why RSU 10 did not have greater representation on the program advisory board. The bidder is noted as leveraging a multi-faceted approach to being able to fund the program after the 21st CCLC grant expires. The roles and commitments between the Franklin County Children’s Task Force and RSU 10 are described. However, the involvement of RSU 10 in the overall implementation of the 21st CCLC program appeared notably limited. The review team would have liked to see greater buy-in and support from the partnering school district to the overall implementation and long-term success of the proposed program.

Section IV. Priority Points	Points Possible: 7	Score: <u>6</u>
------------------------------------	---------------------------	------------------------

Evaluation Team Comments:

This is an expansion proposal.

The proposal does include a school and community partnership consisting of at least one school administrative unit that receives Title I funds under the ESEA.

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

Overall, the proposal provided a moderate level of evidence for other need, citing 72% poverty rate among the schools targeted within the proposal. The proposal also makes notes of challenges related to domestic violence, substance affected births, and juvenile delinquency, but did not cite any specific data sources for statistics.

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

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: Pequawket Kid Charitable Association
DATE: 05/02/25

DEPARTMENT NAME: Education
NAME OF RFP COORDINATOR: Travis Doughty
NAMES OF EVALUATORS: Deborah Gilmer, Jessica McPhail, Melinda Luders

POINT SUMMARY

Section I. General Information (Pass/Fail)

Required Item	Pass	Fail	Comments
1. Cover Sheet	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
2. Responsible Bidder 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	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 H	3	2
Staffing ratios alignment with the recommended instructor to student ratios outlined in Appendix H	2	2
Elements of high-quality programming: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li style="width: 50%;">• Linkages to School Day <li style="width: 50%;">• Student-Driven Programming <li style="width: 50%;">• Strong Instructional Leadership <li style="width: 50%;">• Regular Attendees <li style="width: 50%;">• Safe and Appropriate Environment 	5	5

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

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: Pequawket Kid Charitable Association
DATE: 05/02/25

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	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	3
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)		48

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
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

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

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: Pequawket Kid Charitable Association
DATE: 05/02/25

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	8
Capacity for Success and Sustainability (Maximum 13 Points)		
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)		32

Section IV. Priority Points (7 Total Points)

Priority Points (Maximum 7 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded								
<u>New or Expanded Services:</u>										
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 33%;">Proposal Type</td> <td style="width: 33%;">Companion Proposal</td> <td style="width: 33%;">New or Expansion Proposal</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Priority Points</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> </tr> </table>	Proposal Type	Companion Proposal	New or Expansion Proposal	Priority Points	0	1	1	1		
Proposal Type	Companion Proposal	New or Expansion Proposal								
Priority Points	0	1								
<u>School and Community Partnership:</u>										
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 33%;">Partnership including one or more SAUs that receive Title I, Part A funds</td> <td style="width: 33%;">No</td> <td style="width: 33%;">Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Priority Points</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> </tr> </table>	Partnership including one or more SAUs that receive Title I, Part A funds	No	Yes	Priority Points	0	2	2	2		
Partnership including one or more SAUs that receive Title I, Part A funds	No	Yes								
Priority Points	0	2								
<u>ESEA Accountability Status:</u>										
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 33%;">ESEA accountability status of the school(s) included within the application</td> <td style="width: 16.5%;">No school(s) eligible for “Tier 1”, “Tier 2”, or “Tier 3” support</td> <td style="width: 16.5%;">One or more schools eligible for “Tier 1” or “Tier 2” support</td> <td style="width: 33%;">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	2
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: 33%;">Level of evidence within the application</td> <td style="width: 16.5%;">No Evidence</td> <td style="width: 16.5%;">Moderate Evidence</td> <td style="width: 33%;">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)		5								
OFFICIAL SCORE (Max. 100 points)		85								

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

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: Pequawket Kid Charitable Association
DATE: 05/02/25

EVALUATION TEAM NOTES

Section II. Specifications of Work to be Performed	Points Possible: 55	Score: 48
<p>Evaluation Team Comments:</p> <p>The planning process for the proposal began in January and included representation from both the school and partnering community organization. However, it was not entirely clear who the “board member” participants were in this process. The review team would have liked clarification if these were members of the bidding organizations board or perhaps the advisory board that has been developed for the 21st CCLC program. Despite these facts, the planning process and steps were well thought out and included input from important stakeholder groups.</p> <p>The needs assessment notes that the schools targeted within the proposal have a high poverty rate (65%) and significant levels of students performing below grade level in reading and math. However, no specific achievement data is provided for these content areas. The bidder’s narrative also notes a lack of resources within the community to support identified needs of students. Things like long work hours and commutes for parents were mentioned as challenges within the community that lead to less opportunities for students and greater periods of time where they would otherwise be unsupervised after the school day ends. The general argument for the need for a 21st CCLC program in this community was strong, as were the plans for how such needs would be addressed by having such a program locally. The review team appreciated the monthly opportunities to engage with parents and families through events.</p> <p>With regard to program design, the team felt the bidder’s response was strong, with components of academic enrichment and small group tutoring/interventions in reading and mathematics. These approaches also aligned well with the goals of Appendix D. In terms of students to be served, the review team questioned the total number of students as being 175. This appeared to be the total enrollment for the school, which may not be an accurate figure for students who will receive services. The team questioned why such a high number was included when only 45 students are proposed to reach RLP status. The proposed operational schedules for school year and summer programming meet and far exceed the minimum requirements for the RFP. It is noted that instructional hours will reach 700 during the school year and 170 during the summer. While the review team appreciated this idea of a unique program schedule, it also had concerns around the long-term ability to sustain such a robust program. The potential of “burn out” from both staff and students was a concern. The staff-to-student ratios fall within the requirements of the RFP. The team appreciated the ratios being on the lower end of the allowable range for academic support and tutoring. Under the elements of high-quality programming, school day employees are being prioritized to staff the program and connections to the school day were generally strong.</p> <p>Appendix D of the proposal includes sound strategies and activities that appear reasonable in helping the bidder achieve the goals that have been proposed. Goals related to academic improvement were well-developed and struck a good balance of rigor and reasonableness. For both the health and wellness and enrichment goal areas, the review team would have liked more clarity around the frequency at which each activity type would occur. The proposal notes a number in each of these fields without providing the frequency at which such programming would occur. The family engagement goals were noted as being ambitious. The review team also had a couple of questions about the differences between the strategies and activities and the actual proposed outcomes in this area. For example, strategies that specify monthly events and the proposed outcome of only 2 events for the year were puzzling.</p> <p>The program administration narrative indicated that a program director was already in place and possessed the necessary skills and knowledge to succeed in the role. The bidder notes that school staff would be used as much as possible to bridge the gap between the school day and 21st CCLC programs, including opportunities for shared professional development. The proposed plan for transportation was a bit questionable to the review team. While the school district would transport students to the central location where programming would take place, it seemed the plan was to heavily rely on parents picking students up at the conclusion of programming. It was unclear how the bidder would address transportation challenges being a barrier to some students being able to attend the program. Given the concerns noted earlier in the proposal around the needs of students and families with working parents and long commutes, the lack of transportation home for students seemed problematic. The review team also questioned the lack of information around transportation for summer programming. It was unclear whether this would also require parents to provide transportation for their child(ren). The bidder’s response around the use of volunteers was a bit vague. The team would have liked more information as to <i>how</i> volunteers would be recruited, vetted, trained, etc. to work within and support the program.</p> <p>The proposed program evaluation plans included using multiple measures aligned to school and academic learning standards that include a mix of qualitative and quantitative metrics. The team appreciated the use of parent surveys to ensure that the program is getting feedback from these important stakeholders. In terms of timeline, the bidder’s response indicates that evaluation work would be done a few times throughout the year. The bidder’s response made note of a community impact report that would likely be leveraged to aid in the evaluation of the proposed 21st CCLC program. The review team liked the inclusion of concrete strategies that could be implemented to address areas of underperformance. For example, if student attendance were to become an issue, the bidder makes note of exploring options for enhanced transportation services, reasonable incentives, etc. to further encourage regular attendance.</p>		

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

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: Pequawket Kid Charitable Association
DATE: 05/02/25

Section III. Budget Proposal	Points Possible: 38	Score: <u>32</u>
<p>Evaluation Team Comments:</p> <p>The budget narrative for the proposal indicated a cost per RLP student of \$3,000, which is at the maximum of the allowable range allowed in the RFP. The bidder also notes plans to include program fees as a result of offering this program. While the bidder notes that fees would be waived or scholarships would be offered for students and families who are unable to pay, the review team questioned whether the budget could accommodate the loss of program income from enrollment fees. While in-kind contributions are also referenced in the budget narrative, the review team questioned whether the level of in-kind funding mentioned would be sufficient to support a program of this size. There seemed to be a notable reliance on funding from program fees, which could be challenging if a large number of students and families were unable to pay them.</p> <p>The budget forms have all been completed and include a sufficient level of detail describing the proposed expenditures. It is noted that RSU 72 is meeting and exceeding the required contribution toward transportation costs for the program (75% at \$13,900). However, the narrative provided by the bidder did not give a clear sense of whether these funds were inclusive of summer program transportation costs. It is currently unclear whether these costs are built into the proposed budget. On Form 003, the team questioned why the program director position was funded at a lower rate than that of site coordinators and teachers. It was unclear whether these rates were contractual in nature. It was also troubling to see that the budget did not include any funding at all for employee benefits. This seems like a notable oversight on the part of the bidder and are likely funds that would need to be added to the proposed budget for the program to be feasible. On Form 005, it is noted that \$8,520 was budgeted under contracted services for outside presenters for programming. The review team noted that these services were noted as being completed by volunteers earlier in the proposal.</p> <p>Under program sustainability, the program advisory board is noted as being both diverse and established. The review team appreciated the inclusion of parent representation on the board. The preliminary plans for sustaining program services beyond the life of the 21st CCLC grant seemed to include logical steps for securing supplemental funding to increase funding over time. These plans also included the collection and reporting of data on program operations to help demonstrate the success of the program and build buy-in from community partners and funding organizations. The roles and commitments of the Pequawket Kid Charitable Association and RSU 72 are clearly outlined and demonstrate a strong partnership between these two organizations that would make for a solid foundation to build a new 21st CCLC program.</p>		
Section IV. Priority Points	Points Possible: 7	Score: <u>5</u>
<p>Evaluation Team Comments:</p> <p>This is a new proposal.</p> <p>The proposal does include a school and community partnership consisting of at least one school administrative unit that receives Title I funds under the ESEA.</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 that 65% of the students targeted in the proposal qualify for free and reduced lunch.</p>		

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

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: Ellsworth Public Schools
DATE: 05/01/25

DEPARTMENT NAME: Education
NAME OF RFP COORDINATOR: Travis Doughty
NAMES OF EVALUATORS: Deborah Gilmer, Jessica McPhail, Melinda Luders

POINT SUMMARY

Section I. General Information (Pass/Fail)

Required Item	Pass	Fail	Comments
1. Cover Sheet	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
2. Responsible Bidder 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 H	3	3
Staffing ratios alignment with the recommended instructor to student ratios outlined in Appendix H	2	1
Elements of high-quality programming: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li style="width: 50%;">• Linkages to School Day <li style="width: 50%;">• Student-Driven Programming <li style="width: 50%;">• Strong Instructional Leadership <li style="width: 50%;">• Regular Attendees <li style="width: 50%;">• Safe and Appropriate Environment 	5	4

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

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: Ellsworth Public Schools
DATE: 05/01/25

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	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	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)		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	2
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

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

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: Ellsworth Public Schools
DATE: 05/01/25

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)		
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	2
Section III Total (Max. 38 points)		31

Section IV. Priority Points (7 Total Points)

Priority Points (Maximum 7 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded								
<u>New or Expanded Services:</u>										
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 33%;">Proposal Type</td> <td style="width: 33%;">Companion Proposal</td> <td style="width: 33%;">New or Expansion Proposal</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Priority Points</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> </tr> </table>	Proposal Type	Companion Proposal	New or Expansion Proposal	Priority Points	0	1	1	1		
Proposal Type	Companion Proposal	New or Expansion Proposal								
Priority Points	0	1								
<u>School and Community Partnership:</u>										
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 33%;">Partnership including one or more SAUs that receive Title I, Part A funds</td> <td style="width: 33%;">No</td> <td style="width: 33%;">Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Priority Points</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> </tr> </table>	Partnership including one or more SAUs that receive Title I, Part A funds	No	Yes	Priority Points	0	2	2	2		
Partnership including one or more SAUs that receive Title I, Part A funds	No	Yes								
Priority Points	0	2								
<u>ESEA Accountability Status:</u>										
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 33%;">ESEA accountability status of the school(s) included within the application</td> <td style="width: 16.5%;">No school(s) eligible for “Tier 1”, “Tier 2”, or “Tier 3” support</td> <td style="width: 16.5%;">One or more schools eligible for “Tier 1” or “Tier 2” support</td> <td style="width: 33%;">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: 33%;">Level of evidence within the application</td> <td style="width: 16.5%;">No Evidence</td> <td style="width: 16.5%;">Moderate Evidence</td> <td style="width: 33%;">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	1
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)		77								

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

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: Ellsworth Public Schools
DATE: 05/01/25

EVALUATION TEAM NOTES

Section II. Specifications of Work to be Performed	Points Possible: 55	Score: 41
<p>Evaluation Team Comments:</p> <p>The planning process used to create the proposal began in January of 2025 and included several meetings with district leadership and project partners. However, the review team noted that the meeting and planning time with partner organizations was often much shorter than planning time with school organization personnel. The meetings with partner organizations also didn't begin until much later in the planning process (March). Whereas the proposed program is targeting high school students, the review team would have appreciated seeing some level of involvement from high school students in the planning process for the proposal.</p> <p>In the needs assessment, the bidder provided data specific to community needs. There was note of recent increases in the number of students within the SAU who are experiencing homelessness (increase from 7 to 51) as well as multi-lingual learners (increase from 11 to 21). It was also noted that 43% of students qualify for free and reduced lunch, which was an increase from 33% only a few years ago. The review team did note, however, a lack of information around the academic achievement of students within the school district. The team felt this was a major oversight, given that Ellsworth Public Schools was the lead applicant on the proposal and would have had easy access to the data. This sort of data could have helped make a stronger argument for the need for a 21st CCLC program within the community. While childcare options were noted in the proposal as an area of need, the team questioned the alignment between this need and the 21st CCLC program, which has a more academic focus.</p> <p>The proposed program design included all after-school programs and activities (aside from sports) being consolidated into the resulting 21st CCLC program. The review team felt this was a big plus for removing the "stigma" of students needing additional afterschool supports. The students to be served at each proposed site appear to meet the requirements of the RFP. However, the review team questioned why the high school site seemed to have disproportionately higher enrollment than the elementary/middle school. School year and summer program schedules met and exceeded the instructional hour requirements within the RFP. Staff-to-student ratios are mostly aligned with the requirements of the RFP. However, the team noted that enrichment programming had a ratio that exceeded the maximum in the RFP. The team also questioned whether the ratios presented were appropriate for both elementary/middle school programming and high school programming. It seemed like these two different student populations would have different needs for support. With the Ellsworth Public Schools being the lead on this proposal, there was a strong connection between school and instructional supports for the design and delivery of the program. The district has an attendance coach that will help ensure students at all levels attend the program regularly. The consolidation of afterschool activities into this singular program is noted as boosting attendance at the program overall. The team would have liked to see a bit more in the way of student voice and choice incorporated into the design of the program, especially at the high school level.</p> <p>With regard to Appendix D, the academic goals of 3% improvement for students moving from non-proficient to proficient or above seems reasonable. However, the review team felt that this goal was quite low for the percentage of students demonstrating improvement in math and/or literacy. Given that the program intends to serve 130 RLP students, this would equate to only 4 students demonstrating improvement in these areas. The goals around health and wellness and educational enrichment seemed appropriate given the size and scope of the program. Many of the strategies and activities provided, however, appear to be largely geared toward high school students. The team felt that more information on the elementary/middle school could have made this portion of the proposal stronger. The goals around family engagement, however, also seemed a bit low. For example, the program goals around engaging 30 parents for the 130 RLP students that would be served seemed a bit lower than it should be.</p> <p>The program administration narrative indicates that the bidder has not secured a program director currently. However, the bidder will require a full-time professional with qualifications commensurate with the scope of responsibilities for the position. It is noted that site coordinators would also need to be hired to support the program. The support from school leaders was present and included support around data tracking, interventions, evaluation work, etc. for program staff. The team appreciated that transportation would be offered for all students enrolled in the program. The use of volunteers seems to be already underway from various partnering organizations. However, the narrative provided did not include much information around the bidder's process for vetting and/or training volunteers.</p> <p>The proposed plans around program evaluation are somewhat vague. While the bidder indicates things like student achievement and attendance data will be reviewed, there isn't really information provided on the process or frequency of reviewing this data. This portion of the proposal could have been strengthened by providing a timeline or a frequency at which data would be reviewed and analyzed. The proposal notes that families will be made aware of any program changes. However, the team questioned how students and families would be involved in the evaluation of the program.</p>		

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

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: Ellsworth Public Schools
DATE: 05/01/25

Section III. Budget Proposal	Points Possible: 38	Score: <u>31</u>
<p>Evaluation Team Comments:</p> <p>The budget narrative included a cost per RLP of \$1,923.08, which is well below the maximum amount allowed in the RFP. The narrative notes that there is no fee structure in place currently, but that a future fee structure may be put into place to help address years where grant funding is reduced. The review team would've liked a bit more information on what this new structure might look like and confirmation that no students or families would be turned away for inability to pay such fees. The review team did also note a difference between the in-kind district amounts in the budget narrative and budget forms—totaling a roughly \$10,000 difference.</p> <p>The budget forms indicate that the school district is covering the entire costs of transportation services for the program. However, the review team noted that the bus driver wages and benefits should have been incorporated as part of the transportation costs and not as separate salaries and benefits. On budget Form 003, the review team questioned why the benefit types were not listed. The bidder seems to have simply relisted the various position types in this section of the proposal. On budget Form 005, many of the line items descriptions for various budget lines (food, supplies, staff travel, etc.) are missing. The review team would have appreciated greater context for each of these funding lines within the budget to help demonstrate them as being reasonable and necessary.</p> <p>Under program sustainability, the advisory board included representation from both the school organization and lead partner organization. However, the team noted that the board is heavily made up of school district personnel. The review team liked the fact that the board included a high school representative. However, the review team would have liked representation from a couple of students in order get more input from these important stakeholders. The preliminary sustainability plan mentions things like securing additional funds through other sources, researching potential fee structures, securing additional volunteers, etc. The program director and site coordinators are noted as playing key roles in the grand scheme of program success long term. The roles and commitments of the two lead organizations on the proposal were somewhat vague. The team would have appreciated more details on the specific responsibilities of Ellsworth Public School and the Downeast Family YMCA in terms of the design and delivery of the resulting 21st CCLC program.</p>		
Section IV. Priority Points	Points Possible: 7	Score: <u>5</u>
<p>Evaluation Team Comments:</p> <p>This is a new proposal.</p> <p>The proposal does include a school and community partnership consisting of at least one school administrative unit that receives Title I funds under the ESEA.</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 rates of students living in poverty and significant increases in students experiencing homelessness.</p>		

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

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: Boys & Girls Club of Southern Maine
DATE: 04/29/25

DEPARTMENT NAME: Education
NAME OF RFP COORDINATOR: Travis Doughty
NAMES OF EVALUATORS: Lindsay Barrett, Renee Felini, Sarah Ghazi-Jordan

POINT SUMMARY

Section I. General Information (Pass/Fail)

Required Item	Pass	Fail	Comments
1. Cover Sheet	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
2. Responsible Bidder 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	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 H	3	3
Staffing ratios alignment with the recommended instructor to student ratios outlined in Appendix H	2	2
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	3

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

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: Boys & Girls Club of Southern Maine
DATE: 04/29/25

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	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	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	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	3
Section II Total (Max. 55 Points)		43

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
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

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

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: Boys & Girls Club of Southern Maine
DATE: 04/29/25

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)		
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	5
Roles and commitment of key partners, including involvement with program design and implementation	4	3
Section III Total (Max. 38 points)		29

Section IV. Priority Points (7 Total Points)

Priority Points (Maximum 7 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded								
<u>New or Expanded Services:</u>										
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 33%;">Proposal Type</td> <td style="width: 33%;">Companion Proposal</td> <td style="width: 33%;">New or Expansion Proposal</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Priority Points</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> </tr> </table>	Proposal Type	Companion Proposal	New or Expansion Proposal	Priority Points	0	1	1	1		
Proposal Type	Companion Proposal	New or Expansion Proposal								
Priority Points	0	1								
<u>School and Community Partnership:</u>										
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 33%;">Partnership including one or more SAUs that receive Title I, Part A funds</td> <td style="width: 33%;">No</td> <td style="width: 33%;">Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Priority Points</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> </tr> </table>	Partnership including one or more SAUs that receive Title I, Part A funds	No	Yes	Priority Points	0	2	2	2		
Partnership including one or more SAUs that receive Title I, Part A funds	No	Yes								
Priority Points	0	2								
<u>ESEA Accountability Status:</u>										
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 33%;">ESEA accountability status of the school(s) included within the application</td> <td style="width: 16.5%;">No school(s) eligible for “Tier 1”, “Tier 2”, or “Tier 3” support</td> <td style="width: 16.5%;">One or more schools eligible for “Tier 1” or “Tier 2” support</td> <td style="width: 34%;">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: 33%;">Level of evidence within the application</td> <td style="width: 16.5%;">No Evidence</td> <td style="width: 16.5%;">Moderate Evidence</td> <td style="width: 34%;">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)		4								
OFFICIAL SCORE (Max. 100 points)		76								

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

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: Boys & Girls Club of Southern Maine
DATE: 04/29/25

EVALUATION TEAM NOTES

Section II. Specifications of Work to be Performed	Points Possible: 55	Score: 43
<p>Evaluation Team Comments:</p> <p>The overall planning process to develop the proposal began in March of 2025 and seemed somewhat minimal overall. Most of the documented meetings were also quite short, with most ranging from 15 to 30 minutes in length. The review team noted that most of the collaborative meetings and planning between the two schools partnering on the proposal were on the lower end of this range. It wasn't clear whether other partners in the proposal were included as part of the planning meetings outlined in the proposal.</p> <p>The bidder's assessment of need indicated that the schools selected for the proposal were based on the needs of the partnering school district and was reflective of a needs assessment conducted locally. Students are noted as underperforming in ELA and math, with math achievement being significantly below grade-level proficiency. The review team noted that some of the data quoted in the needs assessment may not have been relevant to the student population targeted in the proposal (pre-k and kindergarten data vs. proposed services for middle school students). The bidding organization seems well positioned to support the target population and demographics of the communities they plan to serve. The bidder's assessment also noted growth in youth becoming disconnected from school, with the intent to help support them through the delivery of 21st CCLC programming within the community.</p> <p>The design of the proposed program appeared to somewhat support the identified goals for the program. However, there the review team would have appreciated greater focus on supporting the academic needs of students. School year programming is noted as occurring for 3 hours per day and 5 days per week. Summer programming is also noted as 5 hours per day and 5 days per week over the course of 8 weeks. The review team noted an emphasis on student voice and choice throughout this portion of the proposal. The team also liked that the clubhouse site was well-equipped with facilities and learning labs. Enrichment activity plans were noted as positive, but the review team questioned how such plans came to be. There was also some confusion around the number of RLP students to be served by the program. Between the program demographics portion of the proposal and the program design section, there were conflicting numbers of students within the proposal. It is noted that the number of low performing students in grades to be served was presented at "24", which would not meet the minimum 25 RLP students required in the RFP. Staff-to-student ratios aligned with the requirements of the RFP. Academic programming and support for students seemed to be less optimal than that of the enrichment programming offered. Things seemed to be limited to homework help without much else in the way of targeted academic interventions and support. Linkages to the school day may be a challenge as the program is located off site and staffed largely by non-school personnel. Data sharing between the program and sending schools appears to be limited to NWEA data. There appears to be a plan to meet regularly as an administrative team to provide non-academic support for students. However, the review team questioned the extent to which these administrative meetings would have an academic focus.</p> <p>In Appendix D of the proposal, the proposed academic outcomes felt a bit low for this type of program. The needs assessment section of the proposal had a focus on significant levels of underperformance in mathematics. However, the proposed programs and interventions related to math/STEM content were limited and mostly involved screen-based programming. The review team questioned why there were not more targeted interventions in this area. This portion of the proposal could have been made stronger by including more targeted strategies and activities that would better support increasing student proficiency in mathematics and literacy. The remaining areas of Appendix D appeared to be well developed. In particular, the areas of health and wellness and family engagement were strong, with the program's facilities having a lot to offer.</p> <p>The plans for program management include an MOU between bidder and partnering school district for the purpose of sharing student data needed for federal reporting, transportation services for students, etc. There is evidence of a strong volunteer program already in place, with a dedicated volunteer coordinator. The review team appreciated the strong leadership structure of the program director having time with students and admin hours on Fridays. It is noted that it did not sound like the bidder had a person in mind for the program director role. The review team also questioned the bidder's plans for professional development among program staff as well as opportunities for shared professional learning with Portland Public Schools. Most training appeared to be available through the Boys & Girls Club as a national organization, but there did not appear to be professional learning opportunities related to academic content and/or support or other areas of particular importance to the 21st CCLC program.</p> <p>The proposed program evaluation efforts included a mix of collecting and reviewing qualitative and quantitative data, tracking both academic and social-emotional growth for participating students. The bidder's narrative notes a commitment to continuous improvement efforts and processes. The evaluation team liked that programs and interventions were noted as being evidence-based. The evaluation findings are also noted as being used to inform the program's continuous improvement work. However, the review team had concerns with academic data being limited to only NWEA results. This information is only available a few times a year and may not be timely enough information around student academic performance. This aspect of the proposal could have been strengthened by creating more timely and intentional sharing of student progress data between program staff and classroom teachers.</p>		

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

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: Boys & Girls Club of Southern Maine
DATE: 04/29/25

Section III. Budget Proposal	Points Possible: 38	Score: <u>29</u>
-------------------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------------

Evaluation Team Comments:

The budget narrative does specify the cost per RLP student for the proposal. However, based upon data provided earlier in the proposal, the review team was able to calculate the actual cost to be \$3,750. This is \$750 per RLP student over the \$3,000 maximum allowed in the RFP. This means the bidder's award amount would either need to be reduced to \$120,000 or the bidder would need to increase the targeted number of RLP students to be served annually from "40" to "50" or more. The program is noted as being of no cost to families. There is also notable funding from partnering agencies to help support the implementation of the proposed program—including the provision of meals and snacks. The review team had questions about the in-kind contributions noted earlier in the proposal that did not appear to be evident in the budget narrative. For example, programming through "Sail Maine" and "Ripple Effect" were not included as in-kind funding or partnerships as part of the program's budget.

Within the budget forms, transportation is covered as a 100% in-kind from Portland Public Schools, exceeding the 35% contribution requirement included in the RFP. On Form 005, the review team questioned the bidder's decision to budget for things like Chromebooks and VR headsets under program supplies. These sorts of items would meet the RFP's definition of equipment and should likely have been budgeted for under that portion of the budget. The program budget included a total of \$32,500 for instructional supplies with limited information on what was being purchased. The review team felt this section of the budget would have benefitted from a greater level of description to account for the items being purchased. The team noted that the overall costs for operating the proposed program site (occupancy, utilities, etc.) were also missing from the budget forms. The team questioned why these sorts of in-kind contributions were left out of the budget. This felt like an oversight and something that should have been included in the overall budget to operate the proposed program.

In terms of sustainability, the program's advisory board is noted as having the required stakeholder groups represented. However, many of the positions are noted as being placeholders with no individuals listed currently listed. Instead, the bidder appears to have used position titles such as "School Liaison" and "Parent or Family Member" to complete this portion of the proposal. It is unclear when or how easily these additional member positions would be filled by actual people. The bidding organization appears to be well-positioned to support overall sustainability work with a history of strong community partnerships. The organization has a strong focus on fundraising and the plan presented could likely help sustain the program beyond the life of the 21st CCLC grant award. The proposal clearly outlines the specific roles and commitments of both the Boys and Girls Club of Southern Maine and Portland Public Schools.

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

Evaluation Team Comments:

This is a new proposal.

The proposal does include a school and community partnership consisting of at least one school administrative unit that receives Title I funds under the ESEA.

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 high levels of students and families living in poverty as well as rising rates of teens not in school and/or not working.

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

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: Lewiston Public Schools (LMS)
DATE: 04/29/25

DEPARTMENT NAME: Education
NAME OF RFP COORDINATOR: Travis Doughty
NAMES OF EVALUATORS: Lindsay Barrett, Renee Felini, Sarah Ghazi-Jordan

POINT SUMMARY

Section I. General Information (Pass/Fail)

Required Item	Pass	Fail	Comments
1. Cover Sheet	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
2. Responsible Bidder 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	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 H	3	3
Staffing ratios alignment with the recommended instructor to student ratios outlined in Appendix H	2	1
Elements of high-quality programming: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li style="width: 50%;">• Linkages to School Day <li style="width: 50%;">• Student-Driven Programming <li style="width: 50%;">• Strong Instructional Leadership <li style="width: 50%;">• Regular Attendees <li style="width: 50%;">• Safe and Appropriate Environment 	5	4

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

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: Lewiston Public Schools (LMS)
DATE: 04/29/25

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	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)		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	3
Budget Narrative aligns with and provides an explanation of content in the budget forms	3	2
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

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

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: Lewiston Public Schools (LMS)
DATE: 04/29/25

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)		
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	2
Section III Total (Max. 38 points)		27

Section IV. Priority Points (7 Total Points)

Priority Points (Maximum 7 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded								
<u>New or Expanded Services:</u>										
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 33%;">Proposal Type</td> <td style="width: 33%;">Companion Proposal</td> <td style="width: 33%;">New or Expansion Proposal</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Priority Points</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> </tr> </table>	Proposal Type	Companion Proposal	New or Expansion Proposal	Priority Points	0	1	1	0		
Proposal Type	Companion Proposal	New or Expansion Proposal								
Priority Points	0	1								
<u>School and Community Partnership:</u>										
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 33%;">Partnership including one or more SAUs that receive Title I, Part A funds</td> <td style="width: 33%;">No</td> <td style="width: 33%;">Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Priority Points</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> </tr> </table>	Partnership including one or more SAUs that receive Title I, Part A funds	No	Yes	Priority Points	0	2	2	2		
Partnership including one or more SAUs that receive Title I, Part A funds	No	Yes								
Priority Points	0	2								
<u>ESEA Accountability Status:</u>										
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 33%;">ESEA accountability status of the school(s) included within the application</td> <td style="width: 16.5%;">No school(s) eligible for “Tier 1”, “Tier 2”, or “Tier 3” support</td> <td style="width: 16.5%;">One or more schools eligible for “Tier 1” or “Tier 2” support</td> <td style="width: 34%;">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	2
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: 33%;">Level of evidence within the application</td> <td style="width: 16.5%;">No Evidence</td> <td style="width: 16.5%;">Moderate Evidence</td> <td style="width: 34%;">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	1
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)		73								

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

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: Lewiston Public Schools (LMS)
DATE: 04/29/25

EVALUATION TEAM NOTES

Section II. Specifications of Work to be Performed	Points Possible: 55	Score: 41
<p>Evaluation Team Comments:</p> <p>The planning process for the proposal began in October of 2024 and included several meetings and work sessions. From the narrative provided, it appears that representation from different stakeholder groups is present. However, the review team had difficulty in determining exactly who planning meeting participants represented. The inclusion of each person’s position or affiliation would have provided helpful information. The review team also noted that several of the work sessions presented in the proposal included only one person. The team questioned whether these constituted collaborative work and if they should have been included in the proposal.</p> <p>The needs assessment included data on the overall community, noting that 24% of Lewiston children live in poverty and 6% of students within the school district experiencing homelessness, which is roughly twice the state average. However, school level student data on things like academics, behavior, attendance, etc. were not included as part of the bidder’s needs assessment. The review team felt this was a notable shortfall of the proposal. As Lewiston Public Schools is the lead applicant on this proposal, such data could have easily been included. Doing so would have provided a much stronger justification for the need for a 21st CCLC program at this school. In terms of meeting the identified needs of students, the proposal notes the provision of academically enriching programming meant to support student needs. Again, it would have been nice to see additional information specific to needed academic supports in order to discern whether the proposed plans for addressing those needs were appropriate.</p> <p>The proposed range and type of programming appear to align with goals of Appendix D. The review team noted aspects of student voice and choice and social and emotional learning as being positive. The proposed number of students and RLP students to be served seems appropriate for the size of the program and requested award. Both school year and summer operational schedules meet the requirements of the RFP, but are noted as meeting the minimum instructional time requirements. When it comes to academic tutoring, the proposed staff-to-student ratios are 1:10, which exceeds the maximum allowed in RFP. With the bidder being the school district, there is strong support from school and district leadership. The review team appreciated that the program would include meals for participants. This is a strong mechanism of support for those living in poverty and/or experiencing homelessness. The proposal also notes high rates of multi-lingual learners (MLs) within the school but doesn’t include specific programming to support these students with their language acquisition skills. The review team felt this was a questionable oversight on the part of the bidder.</p> <p>Within Appendix D of the proposal, the goals for academic improvement all appeared quite low. The review team also felt it was strange that the bidder wrote a new goal in the “strategies and activities” portion of the proposal when compared to the require performance measure outlined in the RFP. The review team would’ve preferred that the bidder craft their goal to meet the format and requirements of the RFP. The review team also had questions about the frequency and participation rate of family engagement goals presented in this section of the proposal. Having only four events per year with only 25% participation among families of participating students seemed low, especially for a program that is hoping to support families in need. Many of the strategies and activities listed in this portion of the proposal are statements of the goal the bidder hopes to achieve rather than the actual strategies and activities that would be carried out to achieve the goals that are presented. The lack of specificity throughout this portion of the proposal made it difficult for the review team to have a clear sense of what the program would be offering for students and families.</p> <p>Under program management, the current program director is a certified teacher and already integrated into the district staff structure. The program site coordinator is also a teacher at Lewiston Public Schools. The school principal is noted as meeting regularly with the program director and site coordinator as well as serving on the program’s advisory board. The review team liked the idea of monthly staff training for Lewiston Public School staff on various topics (curricula, safety, positive youth development, etc.). The proposed communication plan includes interpretation services for students and families who are non-native English speakers. The narrative response around transportation was well crafted. However, the use of volunteers was a bit vague, especially when considering Bates College is the lead partner on the proposal. The review team felt like there should have been a more clear process/connection here.</p> <p>The program evaluation plans indicate the use of both qualitative and quantitative measures and data. However, it is noted that academic data would be collected via grades as opposed to standardized assessment results. While grades can be a useful data point, the team felt it odd that assessment data was outright omitted from the bidder’s response. The bidder did not articulate a particular timeline for conducting a formal evaluation of the program, noting only that work would be conducted “periodically”. The review team would’ve liked a more specific timeline for this work or at least a more concrete plan around the frequency at which work would be carried out. The evaluation data is noted as being reviewed with multiple stakeholders and used to create program improvement goals. However, the review team felt the resulting improvement work may be a bit too heavily geared toward staff training and professional development as opposed to aspects of programming that may need to be changed to better meet the needs of students and families.</p>		

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

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: Lewiston Public Schools (LMS)
DATE: 04/29/25

Section III. Budget Proposal	Points Possible: 38	Score: <u>27</u>
<p>Evaluation Team Comments:</p> <p>The proposed budget narrative appears to align with the proposed program goals as well as the content of the budget forms. The overall cost per RLP student is noted as \$2,730, which falls within the allowable range in the RFP. It is noted that the budget narrative does not specify whether program fees would be charged to participants. The review team assumed this was likely and oversight, but is something that should have been articulated within the budget narrative. There is also a notable amount of in-kind resources from Lewiston Public Schools—particularly around food (Federal food service program, Child and Adult Food Care program).</p> <p>Within the budget forms, Lewiston Public Schools covers the entire cost of transportation services for the year—exceeding the 35% minimum amount. It is noted, however, that the review team questioned why this was incorporated into the budget as cash funding as opposed to an in-kind contribution from the school district. It would seem the school district is providing bussing and drivers to the program as opposed to cash funding to support transportation costs. On Form 001, the review team would have appreciated seeing more specific information on the grants that have been applied for and received in preparation of the upcoming year as opposed to estimated figures. On budget Form 003, the review team questioned the hourly wages being the same for nearly every position type supporting the 21st CCLC program. The rates presented also seemed a bit high to members of the review team. On Form 005, the bidder did not provide any line-item descriptions for the funds included in the budget. In particular, the review team would have appreciated some descriptive information about proposed occupancy, food, supply, and transportation costs. It was unclear how these figures were derived and whether they were appropriate for the program.</p> <p>In terms of sustainability, the program advisory board is noted as being rather large. However, board member representation is largely made up of school district personnel. Representation of community and/or business partners were limited. The review team recommends that the board be expanded to include a more diverse representation of community organizations and resource providers that can support the unique needs of the community. The school district provides a significant amount of in-kind resources to support the 21st CCLC program. The program itself also applies for small, supplemental grants to help support the overall implementation of the program. The role and commitment of Lewiston Public Schools is well defined within the proposal. However, the roles and commitments of Bates College were quite vague. It is unclear to what extent this lead partner organization is involved in the design and delivery of programming. Additional details regarding this aspect of the ongoing partnership between these organizations would have strengthened the proposal.</p>		
Section IV. Priority Points	Points Possible: 7	Score: <u>5</u>
<p>Evaluation Team Comments:</p> <p>This is a companion proposal.</p> <p>The proposal does include a school and community partnership consisting of at least one school administrative unit that receives Title I funds under the ESEA.</p> <p>One or more Tier 3 schools have been included in the proposal.</p> <p>Overall, the proposal provided a moderate level of evidence for other need, citing 92% poverty within the school. The school community also has a high refugee population, with many ML students enrolled in the school. Roughly 6% of students within the SAU are experiencing homelessness.</p>		

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

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: Lewiston Public Schools (MES)
DATE: 05/02/25

DEPARTMENT NAME: Education
NAME OF RFP COORDINATOR: Travis Doughty
NAMES OF EVALUATORS: Deborah Gilmer, Jessica McPhail, Melinda Luders

POINT SUMMARY

Section I. General Information (Pass/Fail)

Required Item	Pass	Fail	Comments
1. Cover Sheet	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
2. Responsible Bidder 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	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 H	3	3
Staffing ratios alignment with the recommended instructor to student ratios outlined in Appendix H	2	1
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	3

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

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: Lewiston Public Schools (MES)
DATE: 05/02/25

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	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)		40

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	3
Budget Narrative aligns with and provides an explanation of content in the budget forms	3	2
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

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

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: Lewiston Public Schools (MES)
DATE: 05/02/25

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	8
Capacity for Success and Sustainability (Maximum 13 Points)		
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	2
2		
Section III Total (Max. 38 points)		27

Section IV. Priority Points (7 Total Points)

Priority Points (Maximum 7 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded								
<u>New or Expanded Services:</u>										
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 33%;">Proposal Type</td> <td style="width: 33%;">Companion Proposal</td> <td style="width: 33%;">New or Expansion Proposal</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Priority Points</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> </tr> </table>	Proposal Type	Companion Proposal	New or Expansion Proposal	Priority Points	0	1	1	1		
Proposal Type	Companion Proposal	New or Expansion Proposal								
Priority Points	0	1								
<u>School and Community Partnership:</u>										
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 33%;">Partnership including one or more SAUs that receive Title I, Part A funds</td> <td style="width: 33%;">No</td> <td style="width: 33%;">Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Priority Points</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> </tr> </table>	Partnership including one or more SAUs that receive Title I, Part A funds	No	Yes	Priority Points	0	2	2	2		
Partnership including one or more SAUs that receive Title I, Part A funds	No	Yes								
Priority Points	0	2								
<u>ESEA Accountability Status:</u>										
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 33%;">ESEA accountability status of the school(s) included within the application</td> <td style="width: 16.5%;">No school(s) eligible for “Tier 1”, “Tier 2”, or “Tier 3” support</td> <td style="width: 16.5%;">One or more schools eligible for “Tier 1” or “Tier 2” support</td> <td style="width: 33%;">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: 33%;">Level of evidence within the application</td> <td style="width: 16.5%;">No Evidence</td> <td style="width: 16.5%;">Moderate Evidence</td> <td style="width: 33%;">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	2
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)		6								
OFFICIAL SCORE (Max. 100 points)		73								

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

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: Lewiston Public Schools (MES)
DATE: 05/02/25

EVALUATION TEAM NOTES

Section II. Specifications of Work to be Performed	Points Possible: 55	Score: 40
<p>Evaluation Team Comments:</p> <p>The planning process for the proposal began in October of 2024, with the narrative noting several different stakeholders involved in the process. The review team notes, however, that the actual planning timeline did not include sufficient information to determine which stakeholders had been involved in the overall planning process. Only first names were provided and many of the planning meetings seemed to only include one or two people (Gretchen and Jenny). It would have been helpful to have more information on which role each person held as part of the planning meetings, particularly around the partnering organizations for the proposal.</p> <p>The needs assessment presented cited several statistics on student demographics (multi-lingual learners, students experiencing homelessness, etc.). There was mention of the high poverty of the school targeted in the proposal evidenced by 92% of students qualifying for free and reduced-price school lunches. The team did note, however, that much of the data provided throughout this portion of the proposal was at the city and/or school district level. The proposal could have been strengthened with more data, beyond poverty information, that would have been specific to the school targeted within the proposal. Student achievement data, for example, is one key data point that should have been included here. The proposed program appears to address a majority of the needs that have been identified, bridging achievement gaps for underperforming student subgroups.</p> <p>In terms of program design, the bidder's responses appear to be aligned with program goals. However, the review team questioned the fact that there was an existing afterschool and summer program at the proposed program site that served over 140 students in the past year. It was unclear how 21st CCLC funds would serve to supplement existing services and why the targeted number of RLP students would only be 75. School year and summer program operational schedules align with the requirements of the RFP but are noted as being at the minimum levels. The staff-to-student ratios mostly adhere to the RFP requirements with the exception of homework help and tutoring, which exceeds the maximum 1:8 ratio allowed. The program is predominantly staffed by school personnel, with lessons that are reviewed by site coordinators. The team questioned the extent to which program partners are involved in the overall operations of the proposed program. The inclusion of partners in this proposal was not as clearly defined as it could have been. Under regular attendance, the team wondered what sort of student and family input the program received that would help increase desire and ability to attend programming regularly. This could have been a good opportunity to uncover and address the ongoing challenges to regular student participation.</p> <p>Within Appendix D of the proposal, the academic improvement targets were noted as being quite low with only 2% of RLP students demonstrating improvement in math and literacy and only 1% of students moving from not proficient or above. The review team also questioned the fact that the bidder provided its own metric instead of what was required in the RFP regarding academic improvement goals from fall to spring in math and literacy. This was a real weakness of the proposal and the review team questioned why the program did not simply include outcomes related to the required performance measures in this section. Throughout Appendix D, the bidder's responses around strategies and activities are often non-descript and simply reiterate the proposed outcomes related to each performance measure. The review team felt this portion of the proposal could have been made stronger by including the actual strategies and activities that would be implemented locally in relation each performance measure to help the program achieve its goals.</p> <p>Under program management, the proposed program director is already in place and qualified to perform the tasks associated with the role. The review team questioned whether 6 individual program sites were too much for one director to oversee. Support from school leadership is strongly demonstrated, with regular meetings to coordinate program services being evident. Staff development plans appeared somewhat general in nature. However, it is noted that there would be collaboration between the program director and school math and literacy coaches within district. The plans presented for recruiting and onboarding volunteers were also a bit vague. There was mention of volunteers following "regular protocols" Lewiston Public Schools has in place. However, there was no real mention of what these protocols were. It would have been helpful to have more information on what these protocols entail.</p> <p>The program evaluation includes a mix of both quantitative and qualitative metrics and data. The team appreciated having youth voice as part of the evaluation work through the collection of youth survey results. The review team would have liked more information about the timeline and frequency at which evaluation work would occur. It was hard for the review team to get a clear sense of what would be happening, when it would be happening, and who would be involved related to the proposed program evaluation work. The bidder's response indicated that the results of evaluation work would be used to make changes to program operations on an annual basis or more frequently, if necessary. As it relates to the evaluation of the program, the review team would have appreciated more targeted, school-level data as well as a more detailed timeline and process for carrying out evaluation work.</p>		

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

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: Lewiston Public Schools (MES)
DATE: 05/02/25

Section III. Budget Proposal	Points Possible: 38	Score: <u>27</u>
<p>Evaluation Team Comments:</p> <p>The budget narrative includes a cost per RLP student of \$2,333.33, which falls within the allowable range of the grant program. There is a description of several sources of in-kind funding. However, additional funding from a different 21st CCLC grant award was not included as part of the in-kind description and the review team wondered what this additional funding would be supporting. The proposal does specify that no fees would be charged for program services. The budget forms also note that nearly all requested grant funds would be going to support staff salaries and benefits necessary to carry out the program (director, site coordinator, instructional staff).</p> <p>The budget forms, while mostly complete, often did not include the sort of line-item descriptions that were required within the RFP. For example, funding for transportation is being covered 100% with school district funds but there was no breakdown to help the review team understand how the \$37,900 cost was derived. It would have been helpful to have more contextual information, particularly on Form 005, to help the review team understand the purpose of all proposed expenses. For example, the form included \$12,940.78 in funding for supplies, with no description of what the bidder intends to purchase. On Form 003, the review team also questioned the largely uniform \$40/hour rate for seemingly all program employees. It was unclear whether this was in response to local contractual obligations.</p> <p>Under program sustainability, the program advisory board is heavily comprised of school and district administrators and program staff, with no students or parents represented. The participation of community partners also appears to be limited with only a few individuals from partnering organizations participating. The various partners listed earlier in the proposal are mentioned again in the sustainability plan. However, the bidder does not provide sufficient information on how these organizations would support the design and development of the resulting program. This portion of the proposal could have been strengthened by more information on what these partner organizations do to enhance the 21st CCLC program and support its long-term sustainability efforts. The roles and commitments of Lewiston Public Schools is evident within the response provided. However, the review team was not presented with a clear understanding of the roles and responsibilities of Bates College. As the lead partner organization on this proposal, the review team would have expected to see more concrete information on how this organization would support the design and delivery of the resulting 21st CCLC program.</p>		
Section IV. Priority Points	Points Possible: 7	Score: <u>6</u>
<p>Evaluation Team Comments:</p> <p>This is an expansion proposal.</p> <p>The proposal does include a school and community partnership consisting of at least one school administrative unit that receives Title I funds under the ESEA.</p> <p>One or more Tier 1 schools have been included in the proposal.</p> <p>Overall, the proposal provided a high level of evidence for other need, citing childhood poverty in Lewiston being higher than the state average as well as median household income being significantly lower than the state average. The school targeted within the proposal has 92% of students qualifying for free and reduced lunch. There was also mention of roughly 7% of students experiencing homelessness within the district. Lewiston also has high population of immigrants and non-native English speakers.</p>		

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

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: Lewiston Public Schools (FES RVCES)
DATE: 05/01/25

DEPARTMENT NAME: Education
NAME OF RFP COORDINATOR: Travis Doughty
NAMES OF EVALUATORS: Deborah Gilmer, Jessica McPhail, Melinda Luders

POINT SUMMARY

Section I. General Information (Pass/Fail)

Required Item	Pass	Fail	Comments
1. Cover Sheet	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
2. Responsible Bidder 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	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 H	3	3
Staffing ratios alignment with the recommended instructor to student ratios outlined in Appendix H	2	1
Elements of high-quality programming: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li style="width: 50%;">• Linkages to School Day <li style="width: 50%;">• Student-Driven Programming <li style="width: 50%;">• Strong Instructional Leadership <li style="width: 50%;">• Regular Attendees <li style="width: 50%;">• Safe and Appropriate Environment 	5	3

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

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: Lewiston Public Schools (FES RVCES)
DATE: 05/01/25

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	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)		40

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	3
Budget Narrative aligns with and provides an explanation of content in the budget forms	3	2
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

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

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: Lewiston Public Schools (FES RVCS)
DATE: 05/01/25

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	8
Capacity for Success and Sustainability (Maximum 13 Points)		
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	2
2		
Section III Total (Max. 38 points)		27

Section IV. Priority Points (7 Total Points)

Priority Points (Maximum 7 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded								
<u>New or Expanded Services:</u>										
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 33%;">Proposal Type</td> <td style="width: 33%;">Companion Proposal</td> <td style="width: 33%;">New or Expansion Proposal</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Priority Points</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> </tr> </table>	Proposal Type	Companion Proposal	New or Expansion Proposal	Priority Points	0	1	1	0		
Proposal Type	Companion Proposal	New or Expansion Proposal								
Priority Points	0	1								
<u>School and Community Partnership:</u>										
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 33%;">Partnership including one or more SAUs that receive Title I, Part A funds</td> <td style="width: 33%;">No</td> <td style="width: 33%;">Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Priority Points</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> </tr> </table>	Partnership including one or more SAUs that receive Title I, Part A funds	No	Yes	Priority Points	0	2	2	2		
Partnership including one or more SAUs that receive Title I, Part A funds	No	Yes								
Priority Points	0	2								
<u>ESEA Accountability Status:</u>										
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 33%;">ESEA accountability status of the school(s) included within the application</td> <td style="width: 16.5%;">No school(s) eligible for “Tier 1”, “Tier 2”, or “Tier 3” support</td> <td style="width: 16.5%;">One or more schools eligible for “Tier 1” or “Tier 2” support</td> <td style="width: 34%;">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: 33%;">Level of evidence within the application</td> <td style="width: 16.5%;">No Evidence</td> <td style="width: 16.5%;">Moderate Evidence</td> <td style="width: 34%;">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	2
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)		72								

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

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: Lewiston Public Schools (FES RVCES)
DATE: 05/01/25

EVALUATION TEAM NOTES

Section II. Specifications of Work to be Performed	Points Possible: 55	Score: 40
<p>Evaluation Team Comments:</p> <p>The planning process for the proposal began in October of 2024, with the narrative noting several different stakeholders involved in the process. However, the review team noted that the actual planning timeline did not include sufficient information to determine who had been involved in the overall planning process. Only first names are provided and many of the planning meetings only included one person (Gretchen). It would have been helpful to have more information on which role each person held as part of the planning meetings.</p> <p>The needs assessment presented include a lot of statistics around community demographics (high rates of multi-lingual learners, students experiencing homelessness, etc.). There was little in the form of student academic performance data, which felt off given the academic focus of the 21st CCLC program. Overall, the review team noted that much of the data provided was for the city and/or school district overall as opposed to drilling down a bit further into the targeted needs of the schools included within the proposal. This felt like a missed opportunity as the school district being the lead on this proposal meant easy access to such data. The proposed plans for addressing the needs that were identified appear sound, but could have been strengthened with additional academic data.</p> <p>In terms of program design, this program appears to be well aligned with goals and is noted as being well-rounded, engaging, and including a focus on SEL practices. The proposed student service targets appear to be reasonable for the size and scope of the program. The review team did note, however, that the target RLP numbers for the program seem to be on a general decline. This looks to be in relation to several challenges resulting from the pandemic and the program's need to undergo a soft "reset". However, the review team felt the decline in enrollment between current program operations and this current proposal were steep at roughly a 50% decline. School year and summer program operational schedules align with the requirements of the RFP but are noted as being at the minimum levels. The staff-to-student ratios mostly adhere to the RFP requirements with the exception of homework help and tutoring, which exceeds the maximum 1:8 ratio allowed. The program is predominantly staffed by school personnel, with lessons that are reviewed by site coordinators. In terms of supporting regular attendance, the team wondered what sort of student and family input the program has received that would help increase desire and ability to attend programming regularly. This could have been a good opportunity to uncover and address the ongoing challenges to regular student participation.</p> <p>Within Appendix D of the proposal, the academic improvement targets were quite low with only 2% of RLP students demonstrating improvement in math and literacy and only 1% of students moving from not proficient or above. The review team also noted that for the academic improvement goals from fall to spring in math and literacy, the bidder provided its own metric instead of what was required in the RFP. This was a real weakness of the proposal and the review team questioned why the program did not simply include outcomes related to the required performance measures in this section. Throughout Appendix D, the bidders responses around strategies and activities are often non-descript and simply reiterate the proposed outcomes related to each performance measure. The review team felt this portion of the proposal could have been made stronger by including the actual strategies and activities that would be implemented locally in relation each performance measure to help the program achieve its goals.</p> <p>Under program management, the proposed program director is already in place and qualified to perform the tasks associated with the role. The review team questioned whether 6 individual program sites were too much for one director to oversee. Support from school leadership is strongly demonstrated, with regular meetings to coordinate efforts. Staff development plans seem somewhat general, but it is noted that there would be collaboration between the program director and school math and literacy coaches. Plans around recruiting and onboarding volunteers seemed vague. There was mention of volunteers following regular protocols Lewiston Public Schools has in place. However, it would have been helpful to have more information on what these protocols entail.</p> <p>The bidder's program evaluation response includes a mix of both quantitative and qualitative measures and data. The review team appreciated having youth voice as part of the evaluation work through the collection of youth survey results. However, the team would have liked more information about the timeline and frequency at which evaluation work would occur. It was hard to determine what would be happening, when it would be happening, and who would be involved related to the proposed program evaluation work. The bidder's response indicated that the results of evaluation work would be used to make changes to program operations on an annual basis or more frequently, if necessary. As it relates to the evaluation of the program, the review team would have appreciated more targeted, school-level data from the individual schools targeted within this proposal as well as more detailed and logical steps to the process.</p>		

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

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: Lewiston Public Schools (FES RVCES)
DATE: 05/01/25

Section III. Budget Proposal	Points Possible: 38	Score: <u>27</u>
<p>Evaluation Team Comments:</p> <p>The budget narrative includes a cost per RLP student of \$2,569.41, which falls within the allowable range of the grant program. There is a description of several sources of in-kind funding. However, additional funding from a different 21st CCLC grant award was not included as part of the in-kind description and the review team wondered what this additional funding would be supporting. The proposal does specify that no fees would be charged for program services, which is noted as positive.</p> <p>The budget forms, while complete, often did not include sort of line-item descriptions that were required within the RFP. For example, funding for transportation is being covered 100% with school district funds but there was no breakdown to help the review team understand how the \$45,000 cost was derived. It would have been helpful to have more contextual information, particularly on Form 005, to help the review team understand the purpose of all proposed expenses. On Form 003, the review team also questioned the largely uniform \$40/hour rate for seemingly all program employees. These rates seemed high and it was unclear whether this was in response to some sort of contractual obligation for school district personnel.</p> <p>Under program sustainability, the program advisory board was made up heavily of school and district administrators and program staff, with no students or parents represented. The participation of community partners also appears to be limited with only a few individuals participating. The various partners listed earlier in the proposal are mentioned again in the sustainability plan. However, the bidder does not provide sufficient information on how these organizations support the design and development of the program. This portion of the proposal could have been strengthened by more information on what these partner organizations do to enhance the 21st CCLC program and support its long-term sustainability efforts. The roles and commitments of Lewiston Public Schools is evident within the response provided. However, the review team was not presented with a clear understanding of the roles and responsibilities of Bates College. As the lead partner organization on this proposal, the review team would have expected to see more concrete information on how this organization would support the design and delivery of the resulting 21st CCLC program.</p>		
Section IV. Priority Points	Points Possible: 7	Score: <u>5</u>
<p>Evaluation Team Comments:</p> <p>This is a companion proposal.</p> <p>The proposal does include a school and community partnership consisting of at least one school administrative unit that receives Title I funds under the ESEA.</p> <p>One or more Tier 2 schools have been included in the proposal.</p> <p>Overall, the proposal provided a high level of evidence for other need, citing childhood poverty in Lewiston being higher than the state average as well as median household income being significantly lower than the state average. The schools targeted within the proposal have over 90% of students qualifying for free and reduced lunch. There was also mention of roughly 7% of students experiencing homelessness within the district. Lewiston also has high population of immigrants and non-native English speakers.</p>		

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

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: Wiscasset Public Schools
DATE: 04/30/25

DEPARTMENT NAME: Education
NAME OF RFP COORDINATOR: Travis Doughty
NAMES OF EVALUATORS: Lindsay Barrett, Renee Felini, Sarah Ghazi-Jordan

POINT SUMMARY

Section I. General Information (Pass/Fail)

Required Item	Pass	Fail	Comments
1. Cover Sheet	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Bidder failed to submit its proposal via the required Grants4ME website</i>
2. Responsible Bidder Form	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Team questioned whether admin assistant is authorized to sign for bidder</i>
3. Abstract	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
4. Program Demographics	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>2 of 3 program sites had fewer than required 25 RLP student minimum</i>
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	1
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 H	3	3
Staffing ratios alignment with the recommended instructor to student ratios outlined in Appendix H	2	2
Elements of high-quality programming: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Linkages to School Day • Strong Instructional Leadership • Safe and Appropriate Environment 	5	3

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

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: Wiscasset Public Schools
DATE: 04/30/25

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	3
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	7
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	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)		33

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	3
Budget Narrative aligns with and provides an explanation of content in the budget forms	3	1
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

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

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: Wiscasset Public Schools
DATE: 04/30/25

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)		
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	2
Section III Total (Max. 38 points)		21

Section IV. Priority Points (7 Total Points)

Priority Points (Maximum 7 Points)	Points Possible	Points Awarded								
<u>New or Expanded Services:</u>										
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 33%;">Proposal Type</td> <td style="width: 33%;">Companion Proposal</td> <td style="width: 33%;">New or Expansion Proposal</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Priority Points</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> </tr> </table>	Proposal Type	Companion Proposal	New or Expansion Proposal	Priority Points	0	1	1	1		
Proposal Type	Companion Proposal	New or Expansion Proposal								
Priority Points	0	1								
<u>School and Community Partnership:</u>										
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 33%;">Partnership including one or more SAUs that receive Title I, Part A funds</td> <td style="width: 33%;">No</td> <td style="width: 33%;">Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Priority Points</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> </tr> </table>	Partnership including one or more SAUs that receive Title I, Part A funds	No	Yes	Priority Points	0	2	2	2		
Partnership including one or more SAUs that receive Title I, Part A funds	No	Yes								
Priority Points	0	2								
<u>ESEA Accountability Status:</u>										
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 33%;">ESEA accountability status of the school(s) included within the application</td> <td style="width: 16.5%;">No school(s) eligible for “Tier 1”, “Tier 2”, or “Tier 3” support</td> <td style="width: 16.5%;">One or more schools eligible for “Tier 1” or “Tier 2” support</td> <td style="width: 33%;">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: 33%;">Level of evidence within the application</td> <td style="width: 16.5%;">No Evidence</td> <td style="width: 16.5%;">Moderate Evidence</td> <td style="width: 33%;">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)		4								
OFFICIAL SCORE (Max. 100 points)		58								

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

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: Wiscasset Public Schools
DATE: 04/30/25

EVALUATION TEAM NOTES

Section II. Specifications of Work to be Performed	Points Possible: 55	Score: <u>33</u>
<p>Evaluation Team Comments:</p> <p>The planning process used to create the proposal began in February 2025 and included multiple individuals from the bidder's organization as well as someone from the lead partner organization. The purpose of planning meetings was often vague, stating things like "planning" or "planning/collaborating". The review team would have appreciated greater context as to the specific purpose of each meeting as well as evidence of greater communication with some of the other community partners noted in the proposal.</p> <p>The bidder's needs assessment was a bit vague, citing the need for a local afterschool program without providing much in the way of data to support such a claim. Some data was pulled from parent surveys to help demonstrate need. However, the survey in question had only a 10% response rate. Of those who did respond, only 25% of parents indicated the need for additional learning opportunity programs within the school district. The review team felt the information provided here did not truly demonstrate the need for a local 21st CCLC program. The bidder's response could have been strengthened by leveraging school academic, community health, and other data that demonstrate the challenges being faced by students and families locally that a 21st CCLC program could help support.</p> <p>The program design response includes aspects of the proposed program that are developmentally appropriate for the students being supported. However, the general response throughout this section of the proposal is somewhat vague. There are a lot of general statements made with regard to program design without the level of specificity the review team would have liked. It was difficult to picture how this program would actually be carried out. The review team also questioned why students from Wiscasset Elementary School were being served by two different program sites. The number of low-performing students in the grade levels served by the proposed Wiscasset Elementary School and Wiscasset Community Center are also noted as being below the minimum 25 RLP students per site. It is unclear how the bidder would meet the program's enrollment requirements given current enrollment data. The proposed school year and summer operational schedules fall within the parameters of the RFP, but as noted as meeting the minimums. The bidder also appears to have been able to add additional response narrative that would not normally have been allowed via the online grant application. The planned staff-to-student ratios are noted as being impressive, with smaller ratios for the earlier grade levels served. This ensures that each student has more direct support from instructional staff working in the program. The bidder notes a strong connection with the school day program as things will be carried out by school day teachers. The team questioned the level of buy-in from teachers into this program and whether teachers are already aware of this intent.</p> <p>In Appendix D of the proposal, the review team noted the academic improvement goals seemed high, particularly when reaching years 3 and 4 of the program. Goals of 100% improvement are often not realistic or attainable and the team worried the program may not be set up for success in the later years of the program. Health and wellness goals include daily strategies and activities to support physical activity, health, and wellness. With the level of outdoor education activities in the proposal, the review team would have liked to see more outdoor safety education training under the strategies and activities for professional and staff development. Many of the strategies and activities noted throughout Appendix D, particularly those around family engagement, were often non-specific. This section of the proposal could have been strengthened by setting more realistic goals for each year of the grant and providing more specific strategies and activities for how such goals would be achieved.</p> <p>The program management narrative indicated requirements and qualifications in a program director that appear to align with the scope of work for the position. There seems to be a strong level of support from school leaders in each building. However, the review team wondered why so much of the proposed work would be the responsibility of these school leaders. With a program director and site coordinators for each program site, the team felt the workload could have been more evenly distributed between these individuals. In terms of information sharing within the school community, the bidder makes reference of making materials available in other languages. However, there was limited information on multi-lingual learners (MLs) being enrolled in the schools to be served. The review team questioned the narrative response provided around plans for transportation. It was often unclear whether transportation was being provided by the school district, third party companies, etc. The proposal included plans around the use of volunteers. However, information on training and vetting volunteers was vague. The team would have appreciated more information around the onboarding process for volunteers.</p> <p>The proposed plans for evaluation, while present, were often vague and non-specific. There is reference to school data, community surveys, etc. that could have been more specific. For example, the mention of academic assessment information, school behavior data, etc. that would likely be used to evaluate the effectiveness of the program could have strengthened this response. The proposal notes quarterly reflection exercises and an annual evaluation of the program. The review team would have appreciated a more developed timeline for evaluation and program improvement as well as the roles and responsibilities that staff would have in the process. The results of evaluation work are noted as being shared with the school committee, community partners, etc. to further build buy-in and community support.</p>		

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

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Center Program
BIDDER: Wiscasset Public Schools
DATE: 04/30/25

Section III. Budget Proposal	Points Possible: 38	Score: <u>21</u>
<p>Evaluation Team Comments:</p> <p>The budget narrative presented indicated a cost per RLP student of \$2,686. However, given the requested award amount of \$282,700 and the bidder's intent to serve 89 RLP students across all three sites, the actual cost per RLP student is \$3,176.40, which exceeds the \$2,700 maximum allowed in the RFP. In order to fall within the allowable parameters of the RFP, the bidder would either need to reduce its request amount to \$240,300.00 or increase the number of RLP students served from "89" to "104". The budget narrative also notes that fees would not be charged to families in the first year of the program but that a sliding fee scale may be implemented in future years. The review team would have liked more information on the potential of a sliding fee scale that may be implemented. The budget narrative also made note of funding from the Community Health Improvement Fund, Title I, and school nutrition, none of which appear to have been included in the actual budget forms.</p> <p>The budget forms do not seem to include the required 35% transportation contribution from the school district. It is unclear whether the bidder intends to support the required portion of transportation costs with school district funds. On both Forms 001 and 002, there is no mention of the Community Health Improvement, Title I, or school nutrition funding mentioned in the budget narrative. On Form 003, the review team questioned the fact that the program director's hourly rate is less than that of teachers working on the program. While the bidder did provide descriptive information on Form 005, the level of detail was a bit lacking. The review team would have appreciated greater information on how the proposed estimates for things like program supplies and student transportation were calculated.</p> <p>The program advisory board is made up of almost entirely school district personnel, with the exception of two individuals from the Wiscasset Community Center. The review team would have liked to see a more diverse representation of community partners, parents, and perhaps even some students serving on the program advisory board. The proposed sustainability plan is noted as being multi-faceted. However, the review team questioned the extent to which some of the proposed actions, such as charging fees for services and leveraging high-school and/or college students over certified teachers might impact program quality. The role and commitments of both Wiscasset Public Schools and Wiscasset Community Center were not entirely clear within the bidder's response. The narrative includes a summary of various partnerships and resources that exist within the community to support the proposed program. However, there is a lack of detail around the specific roles and responsibilities these two organizations would undertake as a result of this proposal. The review team would have appreciated more detail regarding the aspects of program development, implementation, evaluation, and continuous improvement each organization would be tasked with.</p>		
Section IV. Priority Points	Points Possible: 7	Score: <u>4</u>
<p>Evaluation Team Comments:</p> <p>This is a new proposal.</p> <p>The proposal does include a school and community partnership consisting of at least one school administrative unit that receives Title I funds under the ESEA.</p> <p>One or more Tier 1 schools have been included in the proposal.</p> <p>Overall, the proposal provided a low level of evidence for other need, citing only poverty data where just under 50% of students qualify for free and reduced price lunch.</p>		

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: RSU 56
DATE: 4/16/25
EVALUATOR NAME: Lindsay Barrett
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Appendix A – Proposal Cover Page

- All requested information completed.
- Companion proposal; K-5 students from 1 feeder school, Dirigo Elementary School, served at a single site at that school for after school and summer programming.
- Initial budget \$144,944.55; annual decreases calculated correctly.

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

- Signed as requested.

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

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

- Existing after-school and summer program for 75 total/55 RLP students provides data-driven academic intervention and varied enrichment offerings. Trauma-informed program; staff supported with training from partner organization, Community Concepts (CCI).
- Program serves a significant portion of the feeder school population (75 total students/322 = 23%).
- Established partners offer a range of clearly-outlined contributions: training, in-kind supplies, enrichment opportunities.

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: RSU 56
DATE: 4/16/25
EVALUATOR NAME: Lindsay Barrett
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

- Unclear why program projects serving only 15 parents.

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

Planning:

- Collaborative meetings with varied attendees and purposes clearly specified have occurred over 11 months.

Need:

- Data cited from ME Children’s Alliance and Maine Integrated Youth Health Survey regarding the “fragile economy” of the surrounding community and county dropout risk rate. Rural location with limited resources and challenges with parent drug use and physical/mental health.
- Cite parent reports (no specific data) that without no-cost afterschool programming children would not be able to engage in social activities outside of school.
- School has 56% low performing students; some improvement noted from program inception but report there is “still a need to continue supporting students so they can reach their potential.”
- Moderately successful outcomes reported from prior 4 programming years: 40% of participants improved reading and math scores, 12% moved improved to proficient. Teachers report behavior improvements among participants (specific data not shared.)
- No specific data shared about family satisfaction or perceived impact of current programming.

Program Design & Management:

- Students attend 4 days/week for 2.25 hours per day after school; 4 days/week for 6 hours per day in summer. Programming slightly exceeds school year required hours and meets summer requirements.
- Staffing ratios are in the middle of suggested range.

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: RSU 56
DATE: 4/16/25
EVALUATOR NAME: Lindsay Barrett
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

- Academic support delivered in small groups by certified teachers using Title 1 intervention strategies. Intervention and data collection/analysis overseen by school Prevention and Intervention Specialist. Instruction is data-driven and integrated with school MTSS protocols.
- Staff professional development is integrated with school staff offerings; PD time is paid as part of program staff regular working hours.
- Student choice of enrichment activities and other details related to program experience (e.g., nutrition) are emphasized.
- STEM enrichment aligned to Next Generation Science Standards.
- Partnerships support enrichment with reasonable participation goals (e.g., Healthy Oxford Hills for nutrition/gardening, Girls on the Run for physical activity and social-emotional learning.)
- Program Director serves on district PBIS (Positive Behavior and Intervention Support) team; behavior management approaches and expectations mirror those used during the school day.
- Longstanding district partnership with CCI is a strong support for successful trauma-informed programming; CCI will accept student referrals for additional mental health support.
- Certified teachers hired for academic programming; instructors with relevant special experience sought for enrichment programming. Teachers and Ed Techs compensated at rates consistent with district contracts.
- Program Director has an office within the school to enable close collaboration with school staff.
- Program encourages and enables, but does not lean on, volunteer involvement.
- Multi-faceted approach to family engagement programming includes mentions of multiple concrete success-driven strategies (e.g., scheduling family events at pick-up times to maximize foot traffic and serving a meal, using positive reinforcement programs to encourage use of resources sent home.)
- Parent involvement goals are low-moderate but would be impactful.

Program Evaluation:

- Participation has grown each of the first 4 programming years (especially post-COVID)
- State and local assessment data (mClass) used to inform instruction and track student success.
- Program based on performance domains of the School-Age Program Quality Assessment

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: RSU 56
DATE: 4/16/25
EVALUATOR NAME: Lindsay Barrett
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

- Sound evaluation and action plan: trained evaluation team will conduct evaluation in the fall with an Annual Program Quality Improvement Plan developed in December. Responsive planned programming updates reported to Advisory Board for review and discussion.
- Ongoing reporting to local school board and public.

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

III. Budget Proposal

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

Budget Narrative and Forms

- Budget reflects cost of \$2636.26 per student, modestly below the per-student maximum for a single-site program.
- Program offered at no cost to families.
- Emphasis on adequate allocations to achieve staffing ratios and compensating staff commensurate with responsibilities (e.g., certified teacher vs. activity leader.)
- Clear fiscal commitment from school district and leveraging of other funding; School district commitment includes facility use and related occupancy costs clearly delineated, 55% transportation costs, and using Title 1 reallocation grant funding (if awarded) to compensate certified teachers for summer instruction. School nutrition program funding leveraged for serving year-round meals.
- Budget forms clearly specify in-kind contributions from partners that align with budget narrative and program goals (i.e., supplies, enrichment programming, staff training)

Sustainability

- Plans to lean on established partnerships and expand school district funding to continue programming after grant funding.
- Expect that continued experience will help identify programming efficiencies to streamline budget.
- Current budget indicates 21st CCLC funding still integral to program operation after first four-year cycle; unclear whether sustainability measures listed will be sufficient.

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: RSU 56
DATE: 4/16/25
EVALUATOR NAME: Lindsay Barrett
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Priority Points

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

- Poverty Level: Title 1 status referenced throughout; Free & Reduced Priced Lunch rate is 55%. Cites data re: Oxford County poverty level of 15%.
- ESEA Tier 2 status
- Other Need: Cites data re: high dropout risk in Oxford County. Anecdotal information about lack of positive home role models (drug use, mental health challenges).

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: RSU 56
DATE: April 21, 2025
EVALUATOR NAME: Renee Felini
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Appendix A – Proposal Cover Page

- One site, elementary school, grades K-5
- Companion proposal

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

- Signed by superintendent

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

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

- Demographics support program service goals
- Good partnerships for community support and sustainability

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 #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: RSU 56
DATE: April 21, 2025
EVALUATOR NAME: Renee Felini
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

- Proposal shared with the school board
- Good planning process involving advisory board and community partners
- Good use of available data to support community need for program
- Current programming has helped to address student needs
- RSU56 committed to 55% of transportation costs and Title I funds for teacher summer wages
- Program supports student voice/choice and trauma informed practices
- Incorporation of MTSS data
- Program has showed continued growth and serves more than 25 RLP/year
- Summer and School Year schedules within guidelines
- Program Director involvement on PBIS and PLCs will aid linkage to school day
- Good focus on student social and emotional wellbeing by encouraging program and school day communication
- Good plan to lean on current and retired teachers/educators
- Strong considerations and efforts to maintain a safe and appropriate environment for all
- Focus groups, meetings, and surveys to inform program offerings and communication/support plan for regular attendees all positive
- Good program leadership, school leadership support, professional development and communication plans
- Program evaluation plan is well-outlined and thorough
- Continual program improvement demonstrated by evaluation plan

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

III. Budget Proposal

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

- RLP costs within guidelines
- Budget a continuation of current year, not a request for Year 1 amounts, demonstrating commitment to sustainability efforts
- Committed to 55% of transportation costs
- Title I funds utilized for summer programming
- Good allocation of in-kind funding from a variety of sources

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: RSU 56
DATE: April 21, 2025
EVALUATOR NAME: Renee Felini
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

- Reported personnel expenses to align with negotiated contract rates
- Advisory board incorporates school and community advisors, strong community support demonstrated
- Sustainability plan in place and already being displayed by district and community in-kind contributions

Priority Points

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

- Dixfield Home Schoolers and Webb River Seventh Day Adventist School
- Currently Tier 2 according to program evaluation narrative
- Student social and emotional well-being supported by programming and Lead Partner Organization resources

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: RSU 56
DATE: 4/22/25
EVALUATOR NAME: SARAH JORDAN
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Appendix A – Proposal Cover Page

- No comment

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

- No comment

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

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

- **A. Abstract:**
Strengths:
The application identifies the target population to serve 55 LP students K-5 at one site at RSU 56.
The application describes the program design and strategies to address academic, social and emotional learning.
- b. Program Demographics:**
Strengths:
The application proposes to serve a total of 55 RLP students to be served annually and low-performing students.

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: RSU 56
DATE: 4/22/25
EVALUATOR NAME: SARAH JORDAN
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

c.Partners:

Strengths:

The application identifies the lead community partner as Community Concepts and 9 community 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

- **1. Planning:**

Strengths:

The application identifies the planning process beginning Spring 2024 involving RSU 56, CCI and community partners.

Need for Program:

Strengths:

The application demonstrated need for the program with Oxford County data, rural community profile and Socio-economic factors. Current data show 56% of target students are low performing with 12% improvement with existing program. The application will address needs of LP students using strategies to building on the success of the current program with academic interventions and positive behavior supports.

Program Design:

Strengths:

The application describes the research-based activities proposed with academic and enrichment blocks and aligns with goals in Appendix D.

The application describes a plan to attract and retain participants with high interest programming and LP students in the proposed companion program with data from the last 4 years.

The program proposes to collaborate with school day programs by engaging the Prevention and intervention specialist to ensure linkage to school curriculum. The

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: RSU 56
DATE: 4/22/25
EVALUATOR NAME: SARAH JORDAN
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Program Director will serve on school committees (PBIS/PLC) and use reciprocal professional development.

The application proposes a staffing plan including prioritizing certified teachers and use existing recruitment strategies.

The application demonstrates a plan to ensure safe and appropriate environments through using trauma-informed practices and training as well as following existing safety protocols.

The application proposes student driven enrichment programming based on student and parent focus group data on a rotating schedule with diverse modalities.

In appendix D, the application includes clear strategies and activities relating to required academic improvement measurements and target outcomes as well as Health and Wellness, Educational enrichment, Family engagement and Sustainability/Collaboration.

Program Management:

Strengths:

The application describes the single site Program Director FTE, role, desired training and experience managing educational programs, supervising and training staff with weekly contact with school staff.

The application demonstrates a plan to collaborate with school staff by co-locating the Program Director in the target school with weekly supervision of program goals/data collection.

The application describes a plan for staff development including orientation provided by school staff as well as curriculum and academic programming, trauma-informed training by CCI.

The application demonstrates a plan for program communication and outreach including school data collection access to be analyzed and disseminated along with program schedule and information through print and digital methods.

The application describes how transportation will be ensured by RSU 56 district bus system with shared costs meeting the grant requirement.

The application describes how volunteers are coordinated by district and use existing processes. Volunteers will support program staff by lowering ratios and engaging parents.

The application outlines how the program is aligned with the measures of effectiveness by aligning with PA domains and use of evidence based

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: RSU 56
DATE: 4/22/25
EVALUATOR NAME: SARAH JORDAN
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

assessments in math and reading. Programming is based on research such as MTSS.

The application describes an evaluation plan including the PQA assessment for annual evaluation of program goals. Periodic assessment includes the PQA data along with site visits with key findings communicated to the community.

Weaknesses:

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

III. Budget Proposal

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

The proposed program budget and narrative is reasonable and aligns with program goals, meets requirements for cost per student.

The application demonstrates a sustainability plan through well-established partnerships and leveraging resources for enrichment support.

Detailed roles of key partners described.

Priority Points

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

- No comment

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Franklin County Children’s Task Force (RSU 09)
DATE: 4/14/25
EVALUATOR NAME: Debbie Gilmer
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Appendix A – Proposal Cover Page

- All the required elements are present

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

- Complete

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

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

- Two program sites: Academy Hill and Mallett schools in RSU 9
- 112 students to be served annually and 85/day
- 131 students with disabilities are identified but it is not clear how many of these students will be served
- Low performing students are identified as a priority to be served but it is not clear how those students will be prioritized
- The Task Force is the applicant and RSU 9 is the lead partner
- A large number of partners are identified including NPOs, faith organizations, businesses, health, recreation and municipal

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Franklin County Children’s Task Force (RSU 09)
DATE: 4/14/25
EVALUATOR NAME: Debbie Gilmer
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*

- Almost 8 months of planning meetings are documented and partners are well represented
- A strong need is identified including limited access to transportation and afterschool childcare
- The program design includes required elements: tutoring, STEM, arts, physical education, prevention and enrichment
- Data from previous CCLC programs describe improvement plans and objectives achieved
- The proposed program hours/year are met both during the school year and summer
- The Project Director and Site Coordinators are to be hired; proposed qualifications and experience appear relevant and appropriate
- There is strong support from school leadership identified
- More information is needed regarding the removal of transportation barriers especially during the summer (gas cards often don’t solve the issue)
- The program proposes ambitious outcomes in all performance areas
- Multiple measures are utilized with ongoing data collection and analysis planned
- Baseline and end of year assessments are to be utilized including parent surveys
-

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

III. Budget Proposal

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

- The proposal states that the program will not exceed the \$2700 maximum/student but does not identify the per student cost
- \$180,100 is identified as inkind

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Franklin County Children’s Task Force (RSU 09)
DATE: 4/14/25
EVALUATOR NAME: Debbie Gilmer
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

- State and private funding strengthens the proposal (\$47,764 from Bingham and \$4320 from state funding)
- A strong commitment for continuation and sustainability is outlined and builds on leveraging UMF resources and enhancing program viability and community investment via a thoughtful outreach and information campaign

Priority Points

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

- FRL levels: Mallett 41% and Academy Hill 43%
-

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Franklin County Children’s Task Force (RSU 09)
DATE: April 21, 2025
EVALUATOR NAME: Jessica McPhail
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Appendix A – Proposal Cover Page

Positive

All information is present.

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

Positive

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

I. General Information

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

General Information

Abstract

Positive- Abstract demonstrates need for program.

Program Demographics

Questionable- Student receiving Special Ed services is higher than annually served students. Average number of students to be served daily seems high .

Partners-

Positive- Great list of partners to provide a wide list of services.

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Franklin County Children’s Task Force (RSU 09)
DATE: April 21, 2025
EVALUATOR NAME: Jessica McPhail
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

Planning

Positive- Planning looks thorough.

Need for Program

Positive- Need for program is present in several areas.

Program Design

Positive- I think numbers are off under each school heading. But other than that, the design looks good. They have a great plan and

Program Management

Positive- Plan for Directorship looks solid. Collaboration amongst partners will be necessary for running smoothly. Site Coordinators will assist with this as well.

Program Evaluation

Positive- Plan will follow measure of effectiveness, ensuring data-driven decision making, alignment with academic standards, and continuous improvement.

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

Budget Narrative

Positive- Budget Narrative is sufficient.

Budget Forms

Positive- Lots of in-kind donations will increase abilities to offer a robust program.

Capacity for Success & Sustainability

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Franklin County Children’s Task Force (RSU 09)
DATE: April 21, 2025
EVALUATOR NAME: Jessica McPhail
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Positive- The plan for this program looks robust and well thought out.

Priority Points

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

Poverty Level

Positive-

ESEA Accountability Status

Other Need

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Franklin County Children’s Task Force (RSU 09)
DATE: April 24, 2025
EVALUATOR NAME: Melinda Luders
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Appendix A – Proposal Cover Page

- I - Program services grades K-5
- I - 41%/43% free and reduced lunch
- I - Seeking \$218,400.00

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

- Completed

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

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

- P - Program will include full transportation
- P - RLP students is almost the entire amount of students served annually (112 students served annually)
- Q - How is the amount of students served annually (112) lower than the amount of students receiving special education services (131)?
- P - There are a lot of partners that will support this program

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Franklin County Children’s Task Force (RSU 09)
DATE: April 24, 2025
EVALUATOR NAME: Melinda Luders
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*

- P - They have been planning since August the programming
- P - Strong partnership with the school district.
- P - 10 years experience operating 21st CCLC sites
- P - Needs assessment data was given out to parents and staff
- P - Demonstrated need for programming based on child poverty rate, income levels, high ACEs scores, academic struggles
- P - Program will provide academic support, free snacks, SEL activities, parent education and support, and transportation
- I - 2 school sites for after school. 1 - site for summer
- I - Rotating activities for all students through station work model.
- I - This is a companion proposal - Started in the 2022-2023 school year.
- P - Meets minimum grant requirements for operation schedule
- P - Structured communication protocol in place between school district RSU 09 and FCCTF
- I - UMaine Farmington education students are hired to support programming.
- P - 8 hours of PD for all new staff to program.
- P - Multiple measures and protocols in place to ensure a safe and appropriate environment.
- P - Programming is updated every six weeks to promote continued interest in students
- P - Programming incorporates multiple learning styles.
- I - Priority for enrollment is given to students with academic needs
- P - Program Director will be full time
- P - Program staff report weekly with parents/teachers.
- P - RSU 09 staff are encouraged to apply for Program staff positions.
- P - Continued PD for Program staff monthly,
- P - Weekly check-ins used to gather information from staff, school personnel and parents.
- I - Gas cards will be given to families facing transportation challenges.

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Franklin County Children’s Task Force (RSU 09)
DATE: April 24, 2025
EVALUATOR NAME: Melinda Luders
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

- I - Program staff ride bus to support behavior
- I - Program will utilize a community resource, Franklin County Volunteer Network, in order to get volunteers to assist with enrichment activities.
- P - Multiple measures will be used to evaluate student progress
- I - Individualized learning plans are developed.
- P - Program review is 2x/annually. (fall and spring) Multiple measures used include: surveys, advisory groups, 1:1 conversations. All with parents, teachers, Administrators, FCCTF staff, students, community leaders
- I - Using Survey of Academic and Youth Outcomes (SAYO)

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

III. Budget Proposal

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

- N - Cost per student is not exact - only states that it will not exceed the allowable per student cost of \$2700.00
- P - No cost for families to have students participate in program
- P - Program is funded by other grants, district resources, volunteers and other fundraising efforts
- I - \$180,100.00 = In-kind funding
- Q - Curious as to what the ‘Parent Engagement Specialist’ role and responsibilities include.
- I - Does include an equipment purchase \$1149.00
- P - Field trips included in transportation costs
- P - Advisory Board is complete - with no unknown members
- P - Listed specific ways they will increase in-kind donations and community involvement
- I - For visibility of the program, they will host an annual community showcase featuring student projects
- I - increase of 22% of RLP students that will improve in math and literacy
- Q - What local standardized assessment will be used? NWEA? For primary grades?
- I - Continued implementation of Care and Share Food Club. Curious what this is.
- P - Performance measures and outcomes specific with relevant strategies and

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Franklin County Children’s Task Force (RSU 09)
DATE: April 24, 2025
EVALUATOR NAME: Melinda Luders
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

- activities listed for all 6 program goals.
- Q - Why are there no Performance Measures to address ‘truancy/chronic absenteeism’?
 - P - Specific ways listed for parents and caregivers to be involved.
 - I - Attendance records placed in highly visible location to encourage caregiver involvement
 - I - Using RSU 09 teacher workshop days to increase visibility and share information about Program

Priority Points

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

- High Child Poverty Level (16.3%) - exceeding state average
- High unemployment
- Second-lowest median household income in Maine by county

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Franklin County Children’s Task Force (RSU 10)
DATE: 4/19/25
EVALUATOR NAME: Lindsay Barrett
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Appendix A – Proposal Cover Page

- All requested information completed.
- Expansion proposal: Students from 2 feeder schools in RSU10, Meroby Elementary and Rumford Elementary, served at those schools for after school and summer programming.
- Initial budget \$250,000; annual decreases calculated correctly.

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

- Signed as requested.

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

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

- Franklin County Children’s Task Force seeks to manage a holistic out-of-school program based on community need that leverages organizational partnerships.
- Program to serve 120 students /93 RLP students annually across two sites. (Note: Conflicting information entered about whether programming starts at PreK or K.)
- Possible typographical error for number of students receiving special education services (160); number is higher than total students to be served.
- Partners include RSU10 and 16 health/wellness/community organizations.

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Franklin County Children’s Task Force (RSU 10)
DATE: 4/19/25
EVALUATOR NAME: Lindsay Barrett
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

Planning

- Franklin County Children’s Task Force to re-initiate successful operation of a multi-site 21st CCLC in RSU10 after prior programming did not survive district administration turnover.
- Structured planning process with 19 documented collaborative meetings spanning 10 months, including several meetings focused on data.
- Emphasis on designing a sustainable program and maximizing available resources.

Need

- Cites 2025 Kids Count data indicating 16.6% of children in Franklin County live in poverty; unreliable transportation compounds challenges.
- RSU 10 has been impacted by school building closures and resulting displacement.
- Narrative indicates Free and Reduced Price Lunch percentages of the two feeder schools are 86.11% and 87.78% but cover sheet lists 72% for both.
- Rural area with recent notable influx of transients and families living in poverty, attributed to availability of Section 8 housing.
- MaineHealth Stephens Community Hospital Needs Assessment data indicates 78% of respondents cited transportation and Adverse Childhood Experiences as major issues.
- Community programs have made an impact in lowering child maltreatment rate to the fourth lowest for counties in Maine.
- RSU10 has double the state average of teens not in school or working.
- Domestic Violence, substance-affected births and juvenile delinquency rates are additional area challenges. (Specific data not cited.)

Program Design and Management

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Franklin County Children’s Task Force (RSU 10)
DATE: 4/19/25
EVALUATOR NAME: Lindsay Barrett
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

- Students attend 4 days/week for 2.5 hours per day after school; 4 days/week for 6 hours per day in summer. Programming exceeds school year required hours and meets summer requirements. (Note: 31 program weeks listed for school year programming in Appendix C but narrative indicates 30 weeks.) Summer attendance hours calculated incorrectly: 96, not 144.
- Programming occurs directly after school at students’ home schools. Transportation home provided, with program staff riding the buses to support students. Summer transportation offered via designated pick-up & drop-off locations.
- Programming includes structured tutoring and homework help, enrichment activities organized by interest-based student STEAM “clubs” offered on a 6 week rotation, and family engagement and education events and resources-sharing.
- Emphasis on frequent nutrition-educated related programming and use of specific health and wellness and prevention curriculum resources and lessons.
- Emphasis on time spent physical activity achieved via “free and organized play,” with specific examples given of local resources to be leveraged.
- Staffing ratios are at maximum of suggested range.
- Structured feedback process between program tutors/site coordinator and classroom teachers to share program progress updates; unclear about school district commitment to providing return feedback from teachers and collaboration to create the “student learning plans” referenced.
- School and program will have a data-sharing agreement. Unclear what useful data will be shared for students too young to take NWEA assessments.
- Academic support provided by “qualified tutors.” RSU 10 teachers and educational technicians will be encouraged to apply for positions.
- Brief mention of RSU 10 providing professional development for tutors for 1 hr/every 6 weeks, but not elaborated upon.
- University partnerships supply interns. (Some discrepancies about whether partnership is with University of Maine Augusta or University of Maine Farmington or both. Unclear how interns are incorporated into described staffing ratios and whether there are any discrepancies between university calendar and program calendar.)
- Teaching certification not required of Program Director position.
- Family engagement strategies include events to foster connection (e.g., sledding, parade), student performances/demonstrations of learning, and parent education

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Franklin County Children’s Task Force (RSU 10)
DATE: 4/19/25
EVALUATOR NAME: Lindsay Barrett
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

events. (Gas cards to be provided to help families attend events, funded by an “outside source” mentioned but not specified in budget.)

- Printed parent resources will be responsive to population needs, prepared at 4th grade reading level.
- Strategies emphasize multiple modes of contact to promote information sharing and relationship-building between staff and families, though no specific protocol is described (e.g., schedule/frequency of family check-ins).

Program Evaluation

- Program grounded in community needs assessment.
- Progress tracked by NWEA, student learning objectives, teacher-generated rubrics and individualized education plan goals.
- Comprehensive program evaluation scheduled twice annually, including fall baseline gathering and spring full review, incorporating Survey of Academic Youth Outcomes data.
- Procedures/focus for making program updates based on program evaluation not specified in detail.
- Emphasis on family and student surveys throughout to inform programming.

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

III. Budget Proposal

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

Budget Narrative and Forms

- Budget reflects cost of “no more than” \$2700 per student, the maximum for a multi-site program.
- Program offered at no cost to families.
- Narrative indicates the program is supported by private grants but none are listed on budget forms.
- Narrative indicates contributions of organization partners with in-kind programming (i.e., Oxford County Prevention Council, 21st Century Kids of Franklin) but specifics are not described in budget forms.
- \$10,000 in-kind contribution indicated from University of Maine Augusta, Rumford campus for practicum and internship students. (Note: University Partnership details unclear; University of Maine Farmington highlighted in narrative descriptions.)

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Franklin County Children’s Task Force (RSU 10)
DATE: 4/19/25
EVALUATOR NAME: Lindsay Barrett
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

- Narrative indicates “RSU 10 will provide additional academic instruction and support” but not specified further.
- Supplemental funding included for additional contracting of support for enrichment activities; supplemental enrichment supplies with basic examples specified in narrative.
- Fiscal commitment from school district includes the majority of transportation costs, school nutrition funding for snacks and summer lunches, and occupancy costs. (Some lack of clarity around how transportation responsibilities are shared; earlier narrative indicates RSU 10 provides 50% of all bussing but budget forms suggest ~85% school district coverage.)
- \$3000 for Staff Travel listed with minimal additional explanation.

Sustainability

- Multi-pronged and specific plan for program success and sustainability; specific highlights include a mentorship program in which advisory board members recruit and train HS students to be program volunteers, donation supply drives, corporate giving initiatives, focusing on community visibility of programming and leveraging university partnerships.
- Grant application/funding diversifying plans may not be adequate to sustain program past 21st CCLC grant period; (Note: possible typographic error indicates goal of strengthening partnership with RSU9, not 10.)

Priority Points

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

- Poverty: Cites 2025 Kids Count data indicating 16.6% of children in Franklin County live in poverty; unreliable transportation compounds challenges. Narrative indicates Free and Reduced Price Lunch percentages of the two feeder schools are 86.11% and 87.78% but cover sheet lists 72% for both.
- ESEA Status: Not mentioned
- Other need: RSU10 has double the state average of teens not in school or working; domestic violence, substance-affected births and juvenile delinquency rates are additional area challenges. (Specific data not cited.)

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Franklin County Children’s Task Force (RSU 10)
DATE: April 23, 2025
EVALUATOR NAME: Renee Felini
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Appendix A – Proposal Cover Page

- Expansion proposal
- 2 sites, 2 elementaries, grades PreK-4 & grades PreK-5

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

- Signed, executive director

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

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

- Good use of existing data to support need of program
- Partner list includes several community organizations and non-profits
- How will the FCCTF ensure student PII will be protected? Will recruitment for LP students be initiated by the school district?

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 #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Franklin County Children’s Task Force (RSU 10)
DATE: April 23, 2025
EVALUATOR NAME: Renee Felini
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

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

- Parent engagement emphasized
- Continual improvement highlighted in instructional leadership plan
- Good plan to ensure safe and appropriate environment
- Student voice and choice with rotating activities to maintain interest
- Good school leadership support, will school day employees be dually employed by FCCTF and RSU10? How does this impact educator stipend credit (RIF/.22 Maine PERS)?
- Transportation barriers will be addressed
- Evaluation plan aligns with RFP
- Public engagement and communication will enhance sustainability efforts

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

III. Budget Proposal

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

- RSU10 to provide 50% of bussing? Full transportation covered by FCCTF and RSU10? (In-Kind RSU10 = \$72,000/\$12,500 - 21st CCLC Budget for ‘Student Transportation’)
- Advisory Board includes a good mix of district, community and business partners
- Continued public communication about programming will help sustainability
- UMF partnership has promising potential
- Sustainability plan involves a multifaceted approach

Priority Points

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

- Reports no non-public schools located within service area
- 72% free and reduced lunch

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Franklin County Children’s Task Force (RSU 10)
DATE: April 23, 2025
EVALUATOR NAME: Renee Felini
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

- 16% child poverty rate

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Franklin County Children’s Task Force/RSU10
DATE: 4/23/25
EVALUATOR NAME: SARAH JORDAN
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Appendix A – Proposal Cover Page

- No comment

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

- No comment

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

- **A. Abstract:**
Strengths:
The application identifies the target population to serve as elementary RSU 10 students with low academic performance and their families.
- **b. Program Demographics:**
Strengths:
The application proposes to serve a total of 93 RLP students to be served annually and 116/95 low-performing students at 2 school sites.
- **c. Partners:**
Strengths:

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Franklin County Children’s Task Force/RSU10
DATE: 4/23/25
EVALUATOR NAME: SARAH JORDAN
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

The application identifies 16 community partners across

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:**

Strengths:

The application identifies the planning process involving meetings beginning in June 2024 building on a previous partnership and 21st CCLC program and reflects all lead partners involved and community partners.

Need for Program:

Strengths:

The application describes high need in a rural region citing socio-economic factors such as high FRL in target schools, child poverty rates/ACES and community health indicators in the region.

The application will address needs of LP students using strategies to increase academic support, nutritional assistance, social emotional development, family engagement.

Weakness:

The application does not provide evidence of academic need with school-level data for the target population.

Program Design:

Strengths:

The application describes the activities proposed at 2 school sites during the school year and a central site during the summer to include math and literacy

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Franklin County Children’s Task Force/RSU10
DATE: 4/23/25
EVALUATOR NAME: SARAH JORDAN
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

supports, STEM activities, Arts, health and wellness, prevention programming and aligns with goals in Appendix D.

The application describes a plan to target participants and LP students by working closely with RSU 10 and community partners.

The program proposes to collaborate with school day programs through continuous communication process and progress updates.

The application proposes a staffing plan including hiring and training of certified teachers/ed techs and UMaine students.

The application demonstrates a plan to ensure safe and appropriate environments through measures related to behavior management, safety training and protocols

The application proposes student driven programming by rotating activities and age grouping students in alignment with state standards and learning styles.

In appendix D, the application includes strategies and activities relating to required academic improvement measurements and target outcomes as well as Health and Wellness, Educational enrichment, Family engagement and Sustainability/Collaboration.

The program proposes to encourage attendance by reducing barriers: transportation, nutrition and community engagement.

The application proposes a diverse selection of 16 community partners.

Weakness:

The application does not clearly identify how participants will be attracted and retained to the program and ensure required minimum participation levels.

The application does not clearly identify how programming will be linked to school educational instruction.

.

Program Management:

Strengths:

The application describes the Program Director FTE, role, desired training and experience in social services, diverse families and student behavior management.

The application demonstrates a plan to collaborate with school staff through a multi-disciplinary advisory board and track student data. Site coordinators will meet weekly and involve parents.

The application describes a plan for staff development to include assessment of training needs by site coordinators and a training protocol for staff.

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Franklin County Children’s Task Force/RSU10
DATE: 4/23/25
EVALUATOR NAME: SARAH JORDAN
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

The application demonstrates a plan for program communication and outreach weekly with school staff and parents and annually with school board members and the advisory board. Program information provided at school events and chamber of commerce.

The application describes how transportation will be ensured in partnership with RSU 10.

The application describes how volunteers are coordinated at RSU10 and partner organizations and will be overseen by site coordinators.

The application outlines how the program is aligned with the measures of effectiveness in utilizing school assessment data to link with the school day curriculum .

The application describes an evaluation plan that measures performance twice annually, data collection through surveys and quality assessment tools such as SAYO.

Weaknesses:

The application does not clearly indicate the academic needs and how the program will measure effectiveness in improving performance.

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

III. Budget Proposal

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

Strengths:

The proposed program budget and narrative is reasonable and aligns with program goals, meets requirements for cost per RLP.

The application demonstrates a sustainability plan through expanded funding, strengthened partnerships and increased community engagement.

The application outlines the roles of key partners as RSU 10, FCCTF and UMaine at Farmington.

Priority Points

- 1. Poverty Level*

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Franklin County Children’s Task Force/RSU10
DATE: 4/23/25
EVALUATOR NAME: SARAH JORDAN
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

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

- No comment

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Pequawket Kid Charitable Association
DATE: 4/22/25
EVALUATOR NAME: Debbie Gilmer
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Appendix A – Proposal Cover Page

- All required elements are present

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

- Complete

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

I. General Information

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

- Pequawket Kid Charitable Association is the applicant and RSU 72 is the lead partner
- Single site program to be located at Molly Ockett School (K-4)
- 45 students to be served including 4 with IEPs and 1 MLL
- 300 parents are identified to be served—not sure where this number comes from
- Beyond the lead school partner there are no other partners identified

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 #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Pequawket Kid Charitable Association
DATE: 4/22/25
EVALUATOR NAME: Debbie Gilmer
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

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

- Planning began on Jan 13th with partners
- The need for the program appears strong as few resources are available
- A .75FTE Program Director is identified
- The applicant proposes a unique 4 hour/day, 5 days/week program during the school year and an 8 hour/day, 5 days/week in the summer. This seems to make for a very long day for young students (K-4)
- This model greatly exceeds the minimum required hours
- Transportation is provided to the program from sending schools but reliance on parent pickup or car pools may reduce participation from families unable to provide transportation
- Strong connections are identified with the school program including multiple measures of evaluation to be utilized aligned with school and academic performance
- Performance measures propose very ambitious outcomes and more than double participation in out years. Not clear how these will be achieved
- Monthly programs for families and strong communication plans

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

III. Budget Proposal

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

- \$135,000 is requested
- \$29,700 is to be provided in kind by the applicant and lead partner
- Per student cost of \$3000/student is the maximum allowable for single site programs
- The budget includes \$30,000 student fees with fee waivers and scholarships available. This figure seems extremely high given the proposed 45 students to be served

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Pequawket Kid Charitable Association
DATE: 4/22/25
EVALUATOR NAME: Debbie Gilmer
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Priority Points

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

- FRL 65%

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Pequawket Kid Charitable Association
DATE: April 18, 2025
EVALUATOR NAME: Jessica McPhail
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Appendix A – Proposal Cover Page

Positive- Information seems complete

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

Positive- Information is sufficient.

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

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

General Information

Abstract

Positive-

Gives a good overall plan of description of their plan for program.

Program Demographics

Questionable- It sounds as if they expect every student to participate in the program. Is that a reasonable expectation? They only have 30 kids per day listed.

Partners

Positive- It appears the school will provide a large amount of support.

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Pequawket Kid Charitable Association
DATE: April 18, 2025
EVALUATOR NAME: Jessica McPhail
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

Positive- Sufficient information is present to show their plan for implementation.

Need for Program

Positive- The region clearly needs access to such programming. It appears this programming could address several area challenges.

Program Design

Positive- Wide range of topics to keep students engaged. The family nights and workshops can increase outreach.

Program Management

Positive- Staffing plans look adequate

Program Evaluation

Questionable- If they only expect 30 students per day, they must not be expecting regular attendance. This could greatly alter their evaluation results and data.

•

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

III. Budget Proposal

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

Budget Narrative

Positive-

Budget Forms

Questionable- In the beginning they state 30 students daily, but they are using 175 children enrolled overall, which seems to be the whole student body. Are they saying it is OPEN to 175 children, or 175 children will actually be using the program? If they are expecting 30k from fees they are expecting about 171 children to pay the full-time fee. What happens if a large number of families are unable to pay?

Capacity for Success & Sustainability

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Pequawket Kid Charitable Association
DATE: April 18, 2025
EVALUATOR NAME: Jessica McPhail
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Positive- I think the program may need to find additional partnerships to replace the grant dollars. As the program gets going and finds success, this might be easier to do.

Priority Points

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

Poverty Level

Positive- They showed sufficient need.

ESEA Accountability Status

Positive-

Other Need

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Pequawket Kid Charitable Association
DATE: April 25, 2025
EVALUATOR NAME: Melinda Luders
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Appendix A – Proposal Cover Page

- 1 site - Serving Grades K-4
- 65% Free/Reduced lunch
- Requesting \$135,000.00

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

- Completed

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

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

- I - Sustain/enhance current 21st CCLC program
- I - Will service 175 students annually. (that's the same amount in the entire school) 45 RLP students
- I - Interesting that they plan to service 300 parents of students
- Q - How will ALL students in the school benefit from this program? Will they all attend either the after school program and/or summer program?
- N - No community organizations listed in partner organizations category, besides the school district.

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Pequawket Kid Charitable Association
DATE: April 25, 2025
EVALUATOR NAME: Melinda Luders
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*

- P - Many participants in the application process
- P - Solid planning timeline with many stakeholders input
- N - Mentions that a 'significant %age of students are performing below grade level in reading and math' No specific number.
- P - Program will provide supervised activities to aid parents who have long commutes to work, which would otherwise leave students home unsupervised.
- P - Monthly family nights to share resources to families to support their student(s)
- P - There has been thought to maintain enrollment
- P - Summer Programming operation schedule is on the higher end of grant requirements
- P - School year operation schedule includes 5 days a week and 4 hours/day
- P - Tutoring staff/student ratio is 1:5
- P - Priority given to school day employees to staff 21st CCLC programs
- P - Student choose from enrichment options
- P - Program Director is already in place who has experience and qualifications
- Q - How will information be gathered that will then be disseminated?
- N - A robust transportation system is not 100% in place
- P - Multiple measures listed will be used to assess success of program

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

III. Budget Proposal

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

- N - The per student cost exceeds \$2700.00 (\$3000)
- N - There is a fee for students to participate.

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Pequawket Kid Charitable Association
DATE: April 25, 2025
EVALUATOR NAME: Melinda Luders
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

- P - Scholarships and waivers are available
- I - Equipment rental is included in the cost.
- Q - Do students not have 1 to 1 devices in this district that they can use?
- I - No benefits listed for Personnel Expenses
- P - Board Members have diverse affiliations

Priority Points

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

- 65% Free/Reduced lunch

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Ellsworth Public Schools
DATE: 4/14/25
EVALUATOR NAME: Debbie Gilmer
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Appendix A – Proposal Cover Page

- All required elements are present

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

- Complete

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

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

- Lead Partner, Downeast Family Y, is not mentioned in the abstract.
- 200 students to be served annually including 85/day with 100 from the elementary middle school and 100 from the high school
- 20% of students to be served include students with disabilities
- Additional partners include Maine Outdoor School, The Grand, and Energy Management Consultants

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 #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Ellsworth Public Schools
DATE: 4/14/25
EVALUATOR NAME: Debbie Gilmer
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

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

- While the ESEA coordinator was hired 4/24 to address, at least in part, the afterschool needs, the meetings to plan this proposal appear to have begun in March of 2025
- Need appears strong especially the large increase in McKinney Vento (homeless) students
- The program's design focuses on seamless transition and addresses both the academic and child care needs of the community
- A robust programming plan exceeds the minimum requirements (120 days and 240 hours) for both school year and summer programming
- The proposal suggests student-driven programming but falls short on the details (and only one student slot is identified on the Advisory Committee)
- The program's specific objectives are based upon the district's CNA
- The evaluation plan calls for periodic evaluations but provides no details on what those would be
- The district's absenteeism initiative is referenced but there are no measurements identified to evaluate an improvement in chronic absenteeism
-

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

III. Budget Proposal

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

- The per student cost is well below the maximum allowed at \$1,923.08
- The program aims to serve 200 students/year
- The district has identified \$178,949.30 of inkind services
- \$140,206.42 of Title I funds are identified but it is unclear from the budget or the narrative exactly what those funds will cover
- A few reasonable sustainability plans are identified including a tiered fee for service

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Ellsworth Public Schools
DATE: 4/14/25
EVALUATOR NAME: Debbie Gilmer
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Priority Points

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

- Approximately 43% of students served by Ellsworth Public Schools are economically disadvantaged—an increase of 10% in just a few years
- I was unable to find reference to ESEA Accountability status
- Clearly the dramatic increase of McKinney Vento eligible and Multi-Language Learners requires intervention

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Ellsworth Public Schools
DATE: April 15, 2025
EVALUATOR NAME: Jessica McPhail
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Appendix A – Proposal Cover Page

Positive. - Cover page has provided sufficient information.

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

Positive. - Appendix B provides sufficient information.

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

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

Abstract

Positive- Covers needs, prior challenges and plans to overcome challenges.

Program Demographics

Positive- numbers are within RFP limits.

Partners

Positive- Partners are well thought out and offer a wide range of services that can benefit the students

•

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 #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Ellsworth Public Schools
DATE: April 15, 2025
EVALUATOR NAME: Jessica McPhail
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

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

Planning

Positive- Planning has spanned previous months to create a well thought out robust plan.

Need for Program

Positive- Application details how an afterschool program will benefit the area on multiple levels, not just academically. Expanding current services will integrate whole family supports.

Program Design

Interesting- By moving all extra curricular activities (except sports to the afterschool program, the program almost guarantees better attendance, and with that access to tutoring and thereby eliminating any stigma that might be associated with attending for need.

Program Management

Positive- Staffing looks sufficient

Program Evaluation

Positive- The collaboration between program, partners, and school looks encouraging and seamless for students. The position of Director is essential for this to happen.

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

III. Budget Proposal

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

Budget Narrative

Positive- Plan is detailed and shows how they plan to progress as grant money is used.

Budget Forms

Posiitive- Many in-kind donations to support the program and its success.

Capacity for Success & Sustainability

Priority Points

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Ellsworth Public Schools
DATE: April 15, 2025
EVALUATOR NAME: Jessica McPhail
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

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

- Enter your notes here

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Ellsworth Public Schools
DATE: April 23, 2025
EVALUATOR NAME: Melinda Luders
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Appendix A – Proposal Cover Page

- P - services students grades K-12
- P - collaborating with community resources (YMCA)

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

- P - Completed

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

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

- Q - How will this model be sustainable than past programming models? What aspects will touch on the past challenges?
- I - Proposal includes enrichments, academic growth, family/community engagement
- N - Abstract missing health/wellness focus
- N - Abstract missing naming and highlighting the roles of the community partnerships involved
- P - %age of LP students is high based on all students served in the program
- I/Q - 40 special education students out of 85 students (average students served per day) This seems high. Will IEP goals be worked on during this time? How might the academic areas be different for this demographic?

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Ellsworth Public Schools
DATE: April 23, 2025
EVALUATOR NAME: Melinda Luders
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

- Q - What is the total enrollment K-12? What percentage is 200 students that are expected to be served annually with this program?
- P - The partner organizations are diverse (visual arts, outdoor leadership, etc)

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

- P - Based on Meeting Dates/Hours - thorough planning has gone into this proposal -
- I - Concerned that only one - 30 minute meeting was held with community partners: Maine Outdoor School, The Grand, Energy Management Consultants
- I - 1236 is current student population (only 200 students reported to be served by this program)
- P - Partnering with YMCA will help to serve families need for child-care while also giving students academics and enrichments.
- Q - What are the 'family support services' mentioned in the last line going to include?
- P - The description does show a need based on the changing demographics stated.
- I - MDOE identified Tier 1 schools
- I - 100 students served/school.
- Q - Is the need equal at both schools/grade levels?
- P - Operation schedule meets minimum requirements for both afterschool and summer programs
- P - Explanation of linkages to the school day use similar methods to identify students who need support and look to be a seamless transition from the school day.
- P - Safe environment includes: PBIS and ALICE training
- P - Offering transportation is a solution to remove a barrier for attendance
- P - Attendance Coach used in the district's Count ME In initiative will be a resource for this programming.
- P - Program Director will oversee Site Coordinators

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Ellsworth Public Schools
DATE: April 23, 2025
EVALUATOR NAME: Melinda Luders
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

- P - School leaders will be involved in regular meetings with the Program Director to ensure programming and therefore student success.
- P - Program will first try to utilize current staff members who work with the students already.
- P - Multiple measures of data to assess effectiveness of the program
- P - Multiple and various ways to communicate about the program.
- N - Did not mention how they will gather or interpret information about the program - more about what methods they will disseminate.
- P - Bus transportation is an option for all students during the school year program; as well as the summer program.
- I - Volunteers will be used to share information about their expertise. ie financial literacy, nutrition, careers
- Q - Will the volunteers be sharing this information with students or will there be opportunities for families to engage with the volunteers?
- P - Programming will aid in meeting the needs/goals of the district's Comprehensive Needs Assessment.
- Q - Will the programming evaluation be based on student growth? This is what the periodic evaluation implies.
- Q - What data sources will be used? NWEA/Fastbridge? Surveys? Student Grades?
- Q - How will families be involved in the evaluation of the programming

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

III. Budget Proposal

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

- P - Estimate cost per students (\$1923.08) is within the allowable limit
- P - Community partnerships will contribute with in-kind resources
- P - No fee structure, at least the first year. Free for all participants
- P - The district has allocated funding through Title 1 funds and local budget
- Q - Does the narrative amount not equal the school's in-kind amount? (\$166,810.94 narrative/\$178,949.30 in-kind contributions)
- N - Notice that the amount in contracted services only allows programming for 15 students during the school year and 10 during the summer. Seems this would not be a benefit offered to all students who are in the program.

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Ellsworth Public Schools
DATE: April 23, 2025
EVALUATOR NAME: Melinda Luders
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

- P - Program Director role will include fostering collaboration with community and looking for more funding sources for the longevity of the program.

Priority Points

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

- Tier 1 Status in all schools
- Title 1 funding school
- Ellsworth's median income is below county and state's median income rates
- 51 identified McKinney - Vento students
- 536/1236 (43% free/reduced lunch)

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Boys and Girls Club of Southern Maine
DATE: 4/18/25
EVALUATOR NAME: Lindsay Barrett
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Appendix A – Proposal Cover Page

- All requested information completed.
- New single-site proposal; Grades 6-8 students from 2 feeder schools, King Middle School and Lincoln Middle School, to be served at a single site, the Boys & Girls Club of Southern Maine (BGCSM) Portland Clubhouse, for after school and summer programming.
- Initial budget \$150,000 annual decreases calculated correctly.

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

- Signed as requested.

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

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

- BGCSM will start and operate programming for 50 Portland middle school students at their clubhouse, equipped with existing program spaces including 2 gyms, and pool with lifeguards.
- Program to serve 40 RLP students; total students served include 20% who receive special education services and 50% multilingual learners.
- 8 varied partners listed with an emphasis on visual and performing arts.

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Boys and Girls Club of Southern Maine
DATE: 4/18/25
EVALUATOR NAME: Lindsay Barrett
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

Planning:

- BGCSM considered local comprehensive needs assessment data and academic performance data from Portland Public Schools; selected feeder schools based on high concentration of LP students and the needs of working families.
- Planning occurred during brief weekly meetings during March 2025.
- Time spent with school building principals totaled only 30 minutes.

Need:

- School data identifies low academic performance at both feeder schools. (41.1%/33.2% are below proficient on state assessments for ELA and 72.3%/68.6% for math.)
- Narrative refers to 2024 Cumberland County Kids Count profile; cites economic disadvantage and equity gaps in Cumberland county, and a rising percentage of teens not in school. (Data referenced about parents of children under 6 in the workforce does not apply to program participant population.)
- BGCSM programming is tailored to provide inclusive, culturally responsive support to working families.
- Program designed to prioritize LP students for enrollment.
- No other information about specific needs at feeder schools.

Program Design and Management:

- Students will attend 5 days/week for 3 hours per day after school; 5 days/week for 5 hours per day for 8 weeks in summer. Programming exceeds school year and summer required hours.
- Students receive transportation via established routes/routines to the clubhouse from school. Clubhouse is safe and set-up for enrichment programming with 2 gyms, pool with lifeguards, and 3D printing lab.
- Program includes structured homework help and small-group tutoring; academic enrichment options (library visits, comic books, virtual reality) specified for days when students do not have homework assigned. Academic focus will be on

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Boys and Girls Club of Southern Maine
DATE: 4/18/25
EVALUATOR NAME: Lindsay Barrett
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

“school-aligned curriculum themes.” No specific evidence-backed tutoring curriculum or instructional techniques mentioned.

- Daily “wellness block” supports social emotional learning (exact activities not specified.) Staff trained in trauma-informed practices.
- Diverse physical activities offered via club facilities and “mini-courses” in different sports/activities. High participation goals for physical activities.
- Arts activities heavily supported by established partnerships (i.e., various music/dance organizations, Children’s Museum of Maine).
- Leadership activities delivered via “Torch Club” with service project emphasis.
- Specifically-mentioned STEM activities are device-based: Minecraft, Virtual Reality.
- Emphasis on student-driven programming adapted to students’ interests. Multiple references to incentive and recognition programs to encourage participation. Staff aim to be “trusted mentors” and activities emphasize positive peer connections.
- Minimal outdoor activities referenced.
- Staff includes at FT Program Director who oversees compliance/planning and spends M-Th time with students, 30 hr/week Site Coordinator and 2 PT assistants. BGCSM has an established volunteer base and protocols to augment paid staff.
- School partnership includes a formal NWEA data-sharing agreement, assistance in identifying and outreach to students for priority enrollment, regular updates about school curriculum and 2 meetings per month between Program Director and Assistant Principals/Guidance Counselors. No direct collaboration between school teachers and program staff.
- Family engagement plans (events, educational programs, printed resources) are specifically outlined. Key events and points of contact are identified.

Program Evaluation:

- Measures used for program evaluation include: NWEA scores, National Youth Outcomes Initiative tracking of social emotional growth, attendance/participation data and end-of-year family surveys.
- Narrative indicates, “Evaluation findings will guide continuous refinement” and that student data will be reviewed quarterly. No additional academic data consideration specified beyond NWEA scores.
- Reporting will happen in BGCSM annual impact report and data-sharing with Portland Public Schools.

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Boys and Girls Club of Southern Maine
DATE: 4/18/25
EVALUATOR NAME: Lindsay Barrett
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

III. Budget Proposal

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

Budget Narrative and Forms:

- Budget reflects cost of \$3000 per student, the per-student maximum for a single site program.
- Program offered at no cost to families.
- 21st CCLC funding allocations concentrated on achieving staffing ratios of 1:8 for academic support and 1:12 for enrichment and recreation.
- Other funds will cover ~50% of program costs, including Child and Adult Food Care Program funds for all snacks/meals and private, already-secured funds.
- Portland Public Schools will cover full transportation costs as an in-kind contribution.
- Budget includes supply allocations for 30 Chromebooks since school Chromebooks cannot be taken home, plus VR headsets and additional provisions for curriculum-related purchases.
- BGCSM will provide additional administrative support for grant; occupancy costs of clubhouse not specified or included as in-kind contribution.
-

Sustainability:

- BGCSM has a longstanding history of program management and securing philanthropic contributions; sequential fundraising goals aligned to the projected decline in grant funding over four years.
- Advisory board for this program outlined but positions outside of BGCSM are not yet filled.

Priority Points

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

- Poverty Level: Free and Reduced Price Lunch rate of feeder schools is 64%. No other school-specific information about poverty challenges.
- ESEA Status: Not specified

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Boys and Girls Club of Southern Maine
DATE: 4/18/25
EVALUATOR NAME: Lindsay Barrett
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

- Other Need: Brief mention of county data about rising rate of teens not in school or working.

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Boys & Girls Club of Southern Maine
DATE: April 24, 2025
EVALUATOR NAME: Renee Felini
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Appendix A – Proposal Cover Page

- New proposal, one site, two feeder schools, middle school (grades 6-8)

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

- Signed, chief executive officer

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

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

- How will the BGCSM ensure student PII will be protected? (MOU mentioned in 'Elements of High-Quality Programming)
- Five days-per-week at BGCSM's Portland Clubhouse
- \$3750/RLP budgeted with 40 RLP estimated (30 RLP mentioned in 'Program Description')
- The number of LP students at the Portland Clubhouse site in the grades being served listed as 24, which will make it hard to meet guidelines of 25 RLP per site. Is 24 the amount of students at each school, making the total LP 48?
- Good list of partners

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Boys & Girls Club of Southern Maine
DATE: April 24, 2025
EVALUATOR NAME: Renee Felini
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 involved use of data, including NYOI, to support program need
- Good demonstration with existing data for RFP targeted purposes
- Focused effort placed on regional schools with the highest need for structured after school support
- Transportation to BGCSM's Portland Clubhouse will be provided from feeder schools
- Full-day summer programming
- Will there be daily homework support available (twice weekly mentioned)?
- School day linkage might be a struggle with the off-site location and non-school employee staffing
- Facilities will provide quality space for after school programming
- Student voice and choice is emphasized
- Partner organizations contribute potential for additional enrichment opportunities
- Rotating scheduling will help maintain student interest
- School leadership support will be guided by MOU
- BGCSM's strong volunteer program will help with sustainability efforts and programming support
- Continual improvement and program evaluation through use of both qualitative and quantitative data
- Is there parent engagement programming planned?

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

III. Budget Proposal

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

- 30 Chromebooks for completion of assignments and digital learning, 2 VR headsets (purchased without 21st CCLC budget?)

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Boys & Girls Club of Southern Maine
DATE: April 24, 2025
EVALUATOR NAME: Renee Felini
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

- Transportation fully covered by Portland Public Schools
- CACFP for meal and snack funds
- Advisory board has potential to support success and sustainability, but no committed names for several members
- Are staffing positions already filled?
- Focus on cost-free programming for families
- BGCSM is well-positioned to support sustainability efforts with their history of community partnerships and securing philanthropic funding

Priority Points

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

- 64% free and reduced lunch
- Waynflete School

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Boys and Girls Club of Southern Maine
DATE: 4/22/25
EVALUATOR NAME: SARAH JORDAN
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Appendix A – Proposal Cover Page

- No comment

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

- No comment

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

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

- **A. Abstract:**

Strengths:
The application identifies the target population to serve 50 students at King and Lincoln middle schools, five days per week during the school year and summer session at one club site.
The application describes the program design and strategies to improve academic achievement and social-emotional well-being with targeted support for RLP students using staff and student driven activities.

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Boys and Girls Club of Southern Maine
DATE: 4/22/25
EVALUATOR NAME: SARAH JORDAN
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Weakness:

The application references student-driven programming including STEM, arts, physical activity, and leadership enrichment but does not clearly identify the community partners and their roles in the project.

b. Program Demographics:

Strengths:

The application proposes to serve a total of 40 RLP students to be served annually and 24 low-performing students.

c. Partners:

Strengths:

The application identifies community partners as Portland Public Schools, Portland Library, Maine Academy of Modern Music, Portland Youth Dance, 4H, Children’s Museum and Theater of Maine, 317 Main and Sail Maine.

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:**

Strengths:

The application identifies the planning process involving weekly meetings and review of national and local quantitative and qualitative data from needs assessment, program data and NYOI survey. A list of planning meetings were included.

Weakness:

The planning timeframe provided was 3/4/25 – 4/1/25, which is short for a program of this scope and number of partners.

It is not clear from the information provided how partners were included in the planning process.

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Boys and Girls Club of Southern Maine
DATE: 4/22/25
EVALUATOR NAME: SARAH JORDAN
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

2. Need for Program:

Strengths:

The application demonstrated need in academic achievement at the targeted schools using County profile data.

The application will address needs of LP students using strategies as outlined in academic and enrichment support.

Program Design:

Strengths:

The application describes the activities proposed and aligns with goals in Appendix D.

The application describes a plan to attract and retain participants and LP students.

The application proposes elements of high quality programming. The program proposes to collaborate with school day programs through regular meetings with school staff, data sharing agreements, and align with school lesson plans, themes and homework.

The application proposes a staffing plan including a Program Director, Coordinator, Assistants/Tutors and staff training expectations.

The application demonstrates a plan to ensure safe and appropriate environments through existing standards, staff training on safety and positive behavior strategies.

The application proposes student driven programming based on surveys, interests, flexibility to meet diverse needs.

In appendix D, the application includes clear strategies and activities relating to required academic improvement measurements and target outcomes as well as Health and Wellness, Educational enrichment, Family engagement and Sustainability/Collaboration.

The application proposes a diverse selection of community partners to support the STEM, math, literacy and arts programming.

Weakness:

The application doesn't demonstrate how community partners were involved in planning and if the students were surveyed prior to the proposal development in order to design the partnership component.

Program Management:

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Boys and Girls Club of Southern Maine
DATE: 4/22/25
EVALUATOR NAME: SARAH JORDAN
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Strengths:

The application describes the Program Director FTE, role, desired training and experience and supporting staff positions.

The application demonstrates a plan to collaborate with school staff for data-sharing, outreach to students and program evaluation.

The application describes a plan for staff development, training aligned with Continuous improvement.

The application demonstrates a plan for monthly program communication and outreach.

The application describes how transportation will be ensured by leveraging existing system and school district collaboration.

The application describes how existing volunteers are coordinated at BGCSM.

The application outlines how the program is aligned with the measures of effectiveness from the assessment of need, clear performance measures, evidence based strategies, data collection and alignment with school curriculum.

The application describes an evaluation plan that is data driven and supports continuous improvement, a plan to review data and track progress toward goals and disseminate results.

Weaknesses:

The application does not describe how volunteers will be used in the proposed 21st CCLC program.

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

III. Budget Proposal

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

Strengths:

The proposed program budget and narrative is reasonable and aligns with program goals, meets requirements.

The application demonstrates a sustainability plan beyond grant funding through strengthening partnerships, diversified funding and responsive programming.

Priority Points

- 1. Poverty Level*

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Boys and Girls Club of Southern Maine
DATE: 4/22/25
EVALUATOR NAME: SARAH JORDAN
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

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

- No comment

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Lewiston Public Schools (LMS)
DATE: 4/17/25
EVALUATOR NAME: Lindsay Barrett
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Appendix A – Proposal Cover Page

- All requested information completed.
- Companion proposal; Grades 7-8 students from 1 feeder school, Lewiston Middle School, served at a single site at that school for afterschool and summer programming.
- Initial budget \$109,200; annual decreases calculated correctly.

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

- Signed as requested.

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

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

- Lewiston Public Schools seeks to run an after school and summer program for 7th and 8th graders at Lewiston Middle School focused on enrichment opportunities not otherwise available to students.
- After operational challenges during first grant period, district has been working to restructure its program to meet 21st CCLC requirements.
- Program will serve 50 students; 40% are multilingual learners. Anticipate serving 40 RLP students.
- Bates College provides student volunteers.

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Lewiston Public Schools (LMS)
DATE: 4/17/25
EVALUATOR NAME: Lindsay Barrett
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

Planning

- Extensive collaborative meetings over ~5 months; included meeting with state program specialist & other program directors. 2 meetings included the full district advisory board. Varied areas of focus with an emphasis on establishing “realistic and achievable goals.”
- Unclear whether/what data from prior programming was consulted; no mention of participant or family survey implementation.

Need

- U.S. Census data cited to illustrate pervasive need in the city of Lewiston as a result of poverty. Lewiston population includes 15-20% immigrants, “particularly refugees.” Local 16.6% poverty rate is higher than state average and 24% of Lewiston children live in poverty. School Free and Reduced Price Lunch rate is 92%. McKinney-Vento Act data indicates 6% of district students are homeless, double the state average.
- References made to how this pervasive need can impact students (e.g., attendance, academic success), but relevant student academic achievement and behavior data was not included.

Program Design & Management

- Program to operate 2 hrs/day, 4 days/week for 30 school weeks and 4 hrs/day, 4 days/week for 6 summer weeks, meeting minimum program requirements.
- Program operates at Lewiston Middle School and provides transportation home + round trip transportation in summer. This aligns with community need; transportation cited as a known local challenge for out-of-school programming.
- Shared Program Director (between 6 Lewiston sites) and Site Coordinator are certified teachers; staff are considered Lewiston Public Schools employees and “as many as possible will be certified teachers.” Monthly staff training tracked by school district system.

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Lewiston Public Schools (LMS)
DATE: 4/17/25
EVALUATOR NAME: Lindsay Barrett
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

- 1:10 ratio for all activities, which is above suggestion for academic support; small groups and relationships with trusting adults mentioned as program highlights. Programming includes regular student-staff “check-ins” regarding academics and participation, intended to boost homework completion as reported by teachers.
- Student choice of enrichment activities emphasized with varied activity content, formats, and feedback opportunities offered.
- Nutrition education, physical activities, youth leadership, visual and performing arts, STEM and literacy opportunities offered on a rotating basis and at set frequencies throughout the week. Participation in physical activity, STEM, and literacy emphasized in program goals.
- Gardening and Farm-to-Table enrichment opportunities from 4-H and Fork Farm Hydroponics mentioned in program summary but not elaborated upon.
- Program Director and Site Coordinator will review lesson plans for alignment to school day learning standards.
- Targeted academic support plans and approaches not described. Goals around improvement of student test scores are very low (1-2% of students improving); student grades are mentioned as a data point without elaboration.
- Specific considerations for or ways this program would support Multilingual Learners and families are not described.
- Family engagement includes monthly newsletters and 8 events/activities and educational programs. No examples specified. Family survey planned to gather data about effectiveness.

Program Evaluation

- Program based on Youth Program Quality Assessment (PQA) domains. Program will be evaluated using the PQA, fall and spring student grades and Survey of Afterschool Youth Outcomes (SAYO), Program director and building administrators will conduct site observations.
- General description provided of sharing data collected with stakeholders and using it to inform program improvements, either immediately or in the following program year.

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 #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Lewiston Public Schools (LMS)
DATE: 4/17/25
EVALUATOR NAME: Lindsay Barrett
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Budget Narrative and Forms

- Program offered at no cost to families.
- Grant funds allocated completely to salary costs of 1/6 Program Director (shared with 5 other sites), site coordinator and 3 teachers. Hourly rates of all positions listed as \$40/hour.
- Clear fiscal commitment from school district and leveraging of other funding; School district plans to use school funds and Title 1 reallocation grant funds to cover all other costs, including transportation and full cost of summer programming.
- Cost per student is \$2730, above maximum if all the district's combined programs are considered multi-site.
- School district intends to cover the cost of "basic supplies" like "pencils, paper, and photocopies" as in-kind contribution but no budget allocations made for any additional supplies for enrichment activities.
- Specific contributions of partner organizations not reflected in budget forms.

Sustainability

- Longstanding district experience providing after school programming. District leverages existing administrative and technical resources to support program.
- Large advisory board including site coordinators and building administrators from all district program sites.
- Program site will seek small grants to augment programming options.

Priority Points

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

- Poverty Level: Free and Reduced Price Lunch rate is 92%. Local 16.6% poverty rate is higher than state average; 24% of Lewiston children live in poverty. Percentage of district students who are homeless is 6%, double the state average. Lewiston population includes 15-20% immigrants, "particularly refugees."
- ESEA Accountability: Not specified
- Other Need: Not specified

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Lewiston Public Schools (LMS)
DATE: April 22, 2025
EVALUATOR NAME: Renee Felini
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Appendix A – Proposal Cover Page

- One site (program director currently manages 6 sites), middle school, grades 7-8
- Companion proposal

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

- Signed, superintendent

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

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

- Bates College students work as volunteers in the program
- 4-H and Fork Farm also 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 #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Lewiston Public Schools (LMS)
DATE: April 22, 2025
EVALUATOR NAME: Renee Felini
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

- Good use of existing program information to inform planning process
- Good use of available data to support community need for the program
- Poverty and homelessness identified as factors to support need for stable programming for youth
- Student voice and choice and social and emotional learning are positives
- The homework help/tutoring ratios on proposal is 1:10, with 1:4-8 being the suggested staff-to-youth ratio in the RFP
- Good linkage to the school day
- Positive aim to incorporate as many certified teachers as possible
- Aligning standards
- Good plan to ensure safe and appropriate environment
- Consistent meals, programming, and family engagement will support regular attendance
- Program management is led by certified teachers
- Good district leadership support of the program
- Monthly staff trainings
- Good communication plan to include interpretation/translation services
- Transportation provided for both summer and school year programs
- Will state assessments be used to evaluate the program?
- Data from PQA, SAYO, and fall/spring grades will all be utilized to ensure high quality programs
- Program Director to remain active at all sites through visits, observations, and professional development
- Demonstrated commitment to continual improvement

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

III. Budget Proposal

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

- Does the \$2730/RLP exceed RFP? Would this be considered an overall multi-site program?

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Lewiston Public Schools (LMS)
DATE: April 22, 2025
EVALUATOR NAME: Renee Felini
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

- In-kind district (local and Title I) commitment for substantial funding of the programming costs, Federal Food Service Program and Adult Care Food Program as well
- Good advisory board, consider having a community member/business partner not affiliated with sites
- Strong community partnerships with Bates College, Fork Farms, and 4-H will support sustainability
- District committed to transportation and supply costs

Priority Points

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

- 92% free and reduced lunch
- St. Dominic Academy 1085, Central Maine Christian Academy 1208, MMCFC Main Street 2099, MMCFC Memorial Street 2095, and Spurwink Lewiston/Auburn 1237

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Lewiston Public Schools (LMS)
DATE: 4/23/25
EVALUATOR NAME: SARAH JORDAN
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Appendix A – Proposal Cover Page

- No comment

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

- No comment

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

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

- **A. Abstract:**

Strengths:
The application identifies the target population to serve Lewiston Middle School students grades 7-8.
The application describes the program design and strategies to offer educational enrichment, health and wellness during the school year and summer session in partnership with Bates College.

b. Program Demographics:
Strengths:
The application proposes to serve a total of 40 RLP students to be served annually and low-performing students.

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Lewiston Public Schools (LMS)
DATE: 4/23/25
EVALUATOR NAME: SARAH JORDAN
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

c.Partners:

Strengths:

The application identifies partners as Bates College (lead) and 2 community 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*

- **1. Planning:**

Strengths:

The application identifies the planning process involving school staff, existing advisory board and includes a timeline beginning October of 2024.

Need for Program:

Strengths:

The application demonstrated need in terms of the immigrant/multi-cultural community, high poverty rates and homelessness among students. The application will address needs of LP students using strategies in academic support, literacy, STEM, PT, arts, nutritional education and youth leadership.

Program Design:

Strengths:

The application describes the activities proposed to enhance academic achievement and enrichment building off a restructured 2021 companion program and aligns with goals in Appendix D. The application describes a track record of increasing participation in the existing program and LP students served at currently 105/74. The program proposes to collaborate with school day programs by utilizing school cert teachers as program staff and professional development on curriculum and modalities.

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Lewiston Public Schools (LMS)
DATE: 4/23/25
EVALUATOR NAME: SARAH JORDAN
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

The application proposes a staffing plan to hire LPS teachers and staff in the program.

The application demonstrates a plan to ensure safe and appropriate environments through safety protocols, family involvement and staff training. The application proposes student driven programming through activity choice, small group size and seeking student feedback.

In appendix D, the application includes clear strategies and activities relating to required academic improvement measurements and target outcomes as well as Health and Wellness, Educational enrichment, Family engagement and Sustainability/Collaboration. Offerings encourage regular attendance through providing meals and student choice in activities.

The application proposes 2 community partners, Fork Farms and 4H.

Weakness:

The application does not clearly identify what the 2 community partners will offer the proposed program.

.

Program Management:

Strengths:

The application describes the existing Program Director FTE, role, qualifications and experience supported by 6 site coordinators

The application demonstrates a process to collaborate with school staff through regular meetings between principals, program director, site coordinators and advisory board for coordination and data sharing.

The application describes a plan for staff development monthly based on research and best practice in curriculum, SEL and youth development.

The application demonstrates a plan for program communication and outreach through parent events, monthly newsletters. The program Director disseminates data and ensures accessibility to the community with translation.

The application describes how transportation will be ensured through the school bus system during school and summer sessions.

The application describes how volunteers are coordinated through existing LPS process and will be utilized to support teachers facilitate activities and reduce staff rations.

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Lewiston Public Schools (LMS)
DATE: 4/23/25
EVALUATOR NAME: SARAH JORDAN
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

The application outlines how the program is aligned with the measures of effectiveness through needs assessment and standards driven programming, evidence based practices like PQA and SAYO to measure progress. The application describes an evaluation plan that will measure periodic progress with quantitative and qualitative methods. Stakeholders will be involved in data collection and analysis to align program to goals.

Weaknesses:

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

The proposed program budget and narrative is reasonable and aligns with program goals, meets requirements for cost per student. One companion site proposed at LMS.

Weakness:

The application does not clearly state a plan for sustaining the program outside Of grant funding.

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

- No comment

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Lewiston Public Schools (MES)
DATE: 4/22/25
EVALUATOR NAME: Debbie Gilmer
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Appendix A – Proposal Cover Page

- All required elements are present

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

- Complete

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

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

- One program site to be served: Montello
- Lewiston PS is the applicant and Bates the lead partner
- Unclear what the “lead partner” role for Bates means
- High poverty (90+ percent) and low performing student rate well in excess of 50%
- 75 students in grades 1-6 including 30 students with IEPs and 30 multi-language learners
- Programmatic contributions of named partners are mentioned in the abstract
-

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Lewiston Public Schools (MES)
DATE: 4/22/25
EVALUATOR NAME: Debbie Gilmer
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*

- Proposal planning began in October
- Substantial poverty, increasing numbers of homeless students and large population of immigrant populations identified
- Program design seems well rounded and engaging including a focus on SEL practices
- A full time director is identified although the budget indicates .16FTE
- All site coordinators, tutors and program staff are employees (many teachers) of Lewiston PS
- Strong connections identified between the program and school leadership
- Strong communication plan connecting program and school and parents
- It appears that this proposal will fund a replacement to a current afterschool and summer program funded by other than 21st CCLC. This proposal seeks to serve approximately 50% of those currently being served. (Can federal funds supplement?)
- Minimum requirements for hours, etc. are met
- Multiple measures of evaluation are identified including academic measures tied to MLR and local standardized assessment
- All other performance measures are to be measured by number of hours/activity or number of activity by type
-

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

III. Budget Proposal

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

- \$175,000 is requested; all but approximately \$12,000 for materials is allocated to salaries and fringe
- \$2333.33/student is below the maximum allowable

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Lewiston Public Schools (MES)
DATE: 4/22/25
EVALUATOR NAME: Debbie Gilmer
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

- Local and Title I funds are identified as is \$87,175.61 from another 21st Century program—does this increase the per student cost above the maximum allowable?
- \$62,000 is identified as inkind contribution
-

Priority Points

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

- Both poverty level and ESEA performance status indicate a significant need

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Lewiston Public Schools (Montello)
DATE: April 22, 2025
EVALUATOR NAME: Jessica McPhail
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Appendix A – Proposal Cover Page

Positive- Information is complete.

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

Positive- Information is complete.

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

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

General Information

Abstract

Positive- Collaboration with partners looks promising.

Program Demographics

Question- The program only expects to serve one parent per child?

Partners-

Positive- Partners have a wide range of offerings.

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 #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Lewiston Public Schools (Montello)
DATE: April 22, 2025
EVALUATOR NAME: Jessica McPhail
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

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

Planning

Positive- Planning looks robust and thorough.

Need for Program

Positive- There is obvious need for programming with the demographics shown.

Program Design

Positive- Description for programming has a wide range of activities to enrich students' learning.

Program Management

Positive- Directors and Coordinators will be essential to making the program a success and work smoothly with partners and school personnel.

Program Evaluation

Questionable- No feedback from Student of Family is mentioned.

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

III. Budget Proposal

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

Budget Narrative

Positive- LPS has a good plan with partners to cover much of the program.

Budget Forms

Positive -

Capacity for Success & Sustainability

Positive- Given the collaboration there is room for growth and possible new collaborations with other partners in the future.

Priority Points

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

Poverty Level

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Lewiston Public Schools (Montello)
DATE: April 22, 2025
EVALUATOR NAME: Jessica McPhail
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Positive- There is clear need in the district.

ESEA Accountability Status

Positive

Other Need

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Lewiston Public Schools (Montello)
DATE: April 25, 2025
EVALUATOR NAME: Melinda Luders
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Appendix A – Proposal Cover Page

- Q - Why wasn't this school included in the other grant application?
- I - Montello School Grades K-6. 92% free/reduced lunch

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

- Completed

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

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

- I - Program is set up similar to other Lewiston Public Schools
- I - Students will rotate through activities
- P - 75 students served annually. 60 served per day with 50 those students being low-performing
- P - Partner organizations are familiar with programming, as they are already working with other schools
- N - There are only a few partners involved
- Q - Does the limited number of partners - demonstrate a lack of community support?
- N - 2 main participants responsible for grant application.
- Q - Could the program be sustainable without Gretchen and Jenny?

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Lewiston Public Schools (Montello)
DATE: April 25, 2025
EVALUATOR NAME: Melinda Luders
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

- P - Program will target low income, homeless and multicultural students bridge achievement gaps
- P - Program will focus on Literacy, STEM, Physical Education, Visual and Performing Arts, Nutrition Education and Youth Leadership activities.

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

- I - Program will focus on student-selected activities
- P - Activities will be conducted in smaller groups than during regular classes
- P - Exposure to literacy and math skills that low-income students may not experience at home
- P - SEL lessons will be included year-round
- P - After school and summer school programming is already in place.
- P - 147 students participated last year. Already have buy-in from students, families and staff on benefits of this type of programming
- I - Will restructure the current program to meet 21st CCLCP standards
- P - Program operation schedule meets minimum requirements for grant for both school year and summer
- I - Staffing ratios are 1:10 for all areas: Homework Help/Tutoring, Enrichment Programming and Recreational Activities
- P - Program Director and Site coordinators employees of Lewiston Public Schools
- P - Program Director collaborate with District Math and Literacy coaches
- I - Lessons will be reviewed by site coordinators
- P - Program will include community building activities to promote emotional safety
- P - Families will be invited into programs
- P - Will be collecting student feedback to ensure the Program is one that students want to attend.
- Q - How will student feedback be collected?
- P - Students will be served a meal as part of the supper program during school

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Lewiston Public Schools (Montello)
DATE: April 25, 2025
EVALUATOR NAME: Melinda Luders
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

- year program
- P - Breakfast and lunch will be served during summer program
- P - Free transportation offered for all students who participate
- P - Already has a full time program director that manages 6 sites
- P - Site coordinators are teachers at Lewiston Public Schools
- P - School administrators meet regularly with Program Director and Site Coordinators
- P - Participation accountability will be managed through Frontline for monthly PD
- N - Specificity for PD is not there. When, How, Who will facilitate training, etc
- P - Program Director will utilize school parent events, such as Open Houses to share info about the Program
- P - Easy transition from regular school day to after school program, as it is housed in the same building students are at.
- I - Needs Assessment completed and shows need for resources.
- I - Students scoring well below grade level in reading and/or math on state assessments
- P - Program will be based on the Youth Program Quality Assessment

- P - Program lessons will be based around state standards taught during the regular school day.
- P - Multiple indicators of success include, PQA, SAYO, site observations, and student grades

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

III. Budget Proposal

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

- P - Cost per student meets grant requirements (\$2333.33)
- P - Grant will fund salaries. Local funds and Title 1 funds will also be used.
- I - Will be utilizing Federal Food Service Program and Child and Adult Care Food Program for meals
- Q - Are there overlapping funds between this grant proposal and the other proposal for Lewiston Schools? It seems there are, which would make sense.
- Q - By adding schools to this program, will the Program Director keep their

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Lewiston Public Schools (Montello)
DATE: April 25, 2025
EVALUATOR NAME: Melinda Luders
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

- current salary with more schools to oversee?
- Q - In-kind includes occupancy expense. What does this specifically include?
- Q - \$1000.00 for small grants TBD - what will this money be used for?
- I - All the Program positions receive the same hourly rate, even though the coordinators and director have evaluating and other oversee responsibilities.
- I - Transportation costs are not included in the money from the grant
- P - Advisory Board Members are all filled
- N - There are no parents and only a few Board members from the community
- I - Math and Reading Goals are based on growth and also proficiency
- P - Students will have regular check-ins to keep them on track with homework and other academic assignments.
- Q - Why is Teacher Survey Data the only indicator used for Improvement in Student Behavior?
- Q - What will the topics be at the 4 family events held per year?

Priority Points

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

- I - 92% free/reduced lunch
- I - Poverty level is higher than state average (16.6%) 24% of children living in poverty
- I - City's median household income is substantially lower than the state average,
- I - 384/5654 (6.7%) identified as homeless under McKinney-Vento - Higher than state average
- I - 15-20% of population are immigrants

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Lewiston Public Schools (FES RCVES)
DATE: 4/21/25
EVALUATOR NAME: Debbie Gilmer
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Appendix A – Proposal Cover Page

- All required elements are present

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

- Complete

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

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

- Two program sites are identified: Farwell and Connors
- Lewiston PS is the applicant and Bates College the lead partner.
- High poverty and low performing student rate is in excess of 50%
- There is no mention of Bates in the abstract
- It is unclear what the role of Bates is in the program; it is mentioned that Bates will provide volunteers in the abstract and then they are not mentioned again
- 90 students are to be served
- Fork Farms, Girls on the Run and Girl Scouts are identified as additional partners

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

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Lewiston Public Schools (FES RCVES)
DATE: 4/21/25
EVALUATOR NAME: Debbie Gilmer
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

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

- Proposal planning began in October
- Substantial poverty, increasing numbers of homeless students and large immigrant populations identified
- Program design seems well rounded and engaging including a focus on SEL practices.
- A full time director is identified although the budget indicates .33FTE
- All site coordinators, tutors and program staff are employees (many teachers) of Lewiston PS
- Strong connections identified between the program and school leadership
- Strong communication plan connecting program and school and parents
- There is a significant discrepancy between what the currently funded program serves and what this proposal seeks to serve
- Minimum number of hours and days are planned
- Multiple measures of evaluation are identified including academic measures tied to MLR and local standardized assessment
- All other performance measures are measured by number of hours/activity or number of activity by type
-

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

III. Budget Proposal

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

- 218,400 is requested which is allocated exclusively to salary and wages of Lewiston PS staff
- \$2560.41/student served is below the maximum allowable
- Local funds and Title 1 funds cover all other program expenses
- \$62,601.30 is identified as additional federal funds from another CCLC grant—does this increase the per student cost above the maximum allowable?

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Lewiston Public Schools (FES RCVES)
DATE: 4/21/25
EVALUATOR NAME: Debbie Gilmer
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

- No contributions from lead partner Bates College
- Other partner contributions are vague: “come into the schools to provide lessons.”

Priority Points

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

- Both poverty level and ESEA status indicate significant need

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Lewiston Public Schools (Farwell/Conner Elem Schools)
DATE: April 16, 2025
EVALUATOR NAME: Jessica McPhail
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Individual Evaluator Comments: Overall program looks promising and could be very beneficial to the communities.

Appendix A – Proposal Cover Page

Positive- All information is present

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

Positive- Does not appear to have any conflicts that would prevent an application form proceeding.

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

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

Abstract

Positive- Abstract gives a good description of their plan and need of the program.

Program Demographics-

Positive- (Although I do wonder why they only expect to serve an average of 70 kids per day when they schools have 378 and 672 student bodies)

Partners-

Positive- Partners have good possibilities of offerings.

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Lewiston Public Schools (Farwell/Conner Elem Schools)
DATE: April 16, 2025
EVALUATOR NAME: Jessica McPhail
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

Planning

Positive- The planning effort has been 6 months.

Need for Program

Positive- Students who need stability and access to caring adults are apparent in the schools. The program would bolster all of the stated needs.

Program Design

Positive- Activities cover needed topics, have a good plan. Clearly states where challenges have happened and how they plan to address them. Links to the school will be seamless for the students.

Program Management

Positive- Director position will be essential for making program successful. Good communication with school and partners

Program Evaluation

Positive- I like youth voice in the evaluation

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

Budget Narrative

Positive- Covers the necessary information.

Budget Forms

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Lewiston Public Schools (Farwell/Conner Elem Schools)
DATE: April 16, 2025
EVALUATOR NAME: Jessica McPhail
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Positive- All necessary information is present.

Capacity for Success & Sustainability

Positive- I think they have a good plan for the program and will benefit the community. the in-kind supports will be a help to the sustainability of the program.

Priority Points

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

Poverty Level

Positive- the community is largely living under the poverty level and in need of resources and services.

ESEA Accountability Status

Positive

Other Need

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Lewiston Public Schools (Farwell/Connors)
DATE: April 24, 2025
EVALUATOR NAME: Melinda Luders
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Appendix A – Proposal Cover Page

- Program will service 2 - K-6 Schools
- High %age of Free/Reduced Lunch 92%/91%

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

- Complete

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

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

- I - Partnering with Bates college to have college students volunteer during enrichment activities
- I - Programs include: Girls on the Run, 4H, Girl Scouts, Fork Farm Hydroponic
- I - 90 students served annually/70 students served daily
- P - High LP students served daily
- N - %age of students served is small relative to the numbers of students in the schools
- N - only 3 additional partners listed
- P - started planning for grant application in October
- N - Grant application participants were mainly 2 people (Gretchen/Jenny)
- P - Program will target low income, homeless and multicultural students bridge

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Lewiston Public Schools (Farwell/Connors)
DATE: April 24, 2025
EVALUATOR NAME: Melinda Luders
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

achievement gaps

- P - Program will focus on Literacy, STEM, Physical Education, Visual and Performing Arts, Nutrition Education and Youth Leadership activities.

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*

- I - Program will focus on student-selected activities
- P - Activities will be conducted in smaller groups than during regular classes
- P - Exposure to literacy and math skills that low-income students may not experience at home
- P - SEL lessons will be included year-round
- I - Companion Proposal - started in 2021 - had to restructure
- P - since restructuring they have been fully staffed and serve students consistently
- N - This application aims to serve 90 students, where past programming served 131, 221 and 218 students
- Q - Why will the program only be able to serve 90 students?
- P - Program operation schedule meets minimum requirements for grant for both school year and summer
- I - Staffing ratios are 1:10 for all areas: Homework Help/Tutoring, Enrichment Programming and Recreational Activities
- P - Program Director and Site coordinators employees of Lewiston Public Schools
- P - Program Director collaborate with District Math and Literacy coaches
- I - Lessons will be reviewed by site coordinators
- P - Program will include community building activities to promote emotional safety
- P - Families will be invited into programs
- P - Will be collecting student feedback to ensure the Program is one that students want to attend.
- Q - How will student feedback be collected?

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Lewiston Public Schools (Farwell/Connors)
DATE: April 24, 2025
EVALUATOR NAME: Melinda Luders
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

- P - Students will be served a meal as part of the supper program during school year program
- P - Breakfast and lunch will be served during summer program
- P - Free transportation offered for all students who participate
- P - Already has a full time program director that manages 6 sites
- P - Site coordinators are teachers at Lewiston Public Schools
- P - School administrators meet regularly with Program Director and Site Coordinators
- P - Participation accountability will be managed through Frontline for monthly PD
- N - Specificity for PD is not there. When, How, Who will facilitate training, etc
- P - Program Director will utilize school parent events, such as Open Houses to share info about the Program
- P - Easy transition from regular school day to after school program, as it is housed in the same building students are at.
- I - Needs Assessment completed and shows need for resources.
- I - Students scoring well below grade level in reading and/or math on state assessments
- P - Program will be based on the Youth Program Quality Assessment
- P - Program lessons will be based around state standards taught during the regular school day.
- P - Multiple indicators of success include, PQA, SAYO, site observations, and student grades

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

III. Budget Proposal

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

- P - Cost per student meets grant requirements (\$2,569.41)
- P - Grant will fund salaries. Local funds and Title 1 funds will also be used.
- I - Will be utilizing Federal Food Service Program and Child and Adult Care Food Program for meals
- Q - In-kind includes occupancy expense. What does this specifically include?
- Q - \$1000.00 for small grants TBD - what will this money be used for?
- I - All the Program positions receive the same hourly rate, even though the

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Lewiston Public Schools (Farwell/Connors)
DATE: April 24, 2025
EVALUATOR NAME: Melinda Luders
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

- coordinators and director have evaluating and other oversee responsibilities.
- I - Transportation costs are not included in the money from the grant
 - P - Advisory Board Members are all filled
 - N - There are no parents and only a few Board members from the community
 - I - Math and Reading Goals are based on growth and also proficiency
 - Q - Why is Teacher Survey Data the only indicator used for Improvement in Student Behavior?
 - Q - What will the topics be at the 4 family events held per year?

Priority Points

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

- I - Poverty level is higher than state average (16.6%) 24% of children living in poverty
- I - City's median household income is substantially lower than the state average,
- I - 384/5654 (6.7%) identified as homeless under McKinney-Vento - Higher than state average
- I - 15-20% of population are immigrants

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Wiscasset School Department
DATE: 4/16/25
EVALUATOR NAME: Lindsay Barrett
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Appendix A – Proposal Cover Page

- Does not appear to have used the Department’s online proposal website.
- All requested information appears to be completed.
- New multi-site proposal; PreK-12 students from 2 feeder schools (Wiscasset Elementary + Middle/High School) served across 3 sites for PreK-2, 3-5 and 6-12 students (at schools + local community center).
- Initial budget \$282,700; annual decreases calculated correctly.

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

- Signed as requested.

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

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

- Intends to serve 117 students (76% are Low Performing, 28% receive Special Education services) for 1.5 hours after school daily for academic intervention and exploratory opportunities. (PreK-2 also receives 30 min before school.)
- Parent programming for 234 parents focuses on home math & literacy support (assumes 2 parents/child).

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Wiscasset School Department
DATE: 4/16/25
EVALUATOR NAME: Lindsay Barrett
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

- 11 additional partner organizations, including Head Start, public library, general public health organizations, plus a particular emphasis on organizations supporting outdoor & experiential learning.

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

Planning and Need:

- Planning process included 8+ meetings over 5 weeks between school building principals, district administration, and in some cases, parks & recreation staff.
- Meeting participants consulted student data to plan academic support structures and enrichment (examples/data not shared).
- Parent survey completed by 10% of MS/HS families (~20 respondents); 25% identified a lack of opportunities for students to learn from community members.
- Other parent concerns listed without specific data include: lack of non-athletic extra-curricular options, need for academic enrichment for elementary school students, lack of consistent & equitable before and after-school programming that supports parent work schedules.

Program Design and Management:

- Logistics are sound and developmentally-appropriate. Proposed sites are safe, familiar and convenient; bus/van transportation arranged from school to community center (grades 3-5) plus 2 vans available for community-based excursions; bus/van transportation home arranged for all students.
- Coordinated approach to enrollment and retention; schools will advertise programming during events/family communication and also refer and monitor students via MTSS (Multi-tiered Systems of Support) and RTI (Response to Intervention) protocols.
- Program will be staffed by district teachers and educational technicians; school building administrators will serve as advisors and oversee staff professional development and curriculum coordination. Planned CLC staffing ratios are all

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Wiscasset School Department
DATE: 4/16/25
EVALUATOR NAME: Lindsay Barrett
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

lower than suggested limits, with particular emphasis on ample staffing in the early childhood and elementary programs.

- Program will use a PBIS management approach consistent with school practices; Hearty Roots, a nature-based youth development organization, will be a partner in establishing a supportive learning environment. Emphasis on staff-student relationships and student engagement/interest.
- Developmentally appropriate progression of programming format, with guided choice time/stations for PreK-2, student-selected activities from a variety of options for 3-5, and student-driven projects and enrichment for 6-12.
- Partnerships with established health and wellness organizations will drive programming in those areas (e.g., SNAP, First 10).
- Emphasis on outdoor and physical activity and a “diverse range of enrichment activities” in STEM, arts, career exploration aimed at building creativity, critical thinking, and problem solving. Plan to leverage community partnerships to offer outdoor, place-based, experiential learning opportunities.
- Program schedule just meets minimum requirements for 240 hours/school year and 90 hours/summer.
- Programs, specific structure, and staff preparation for “tutoring and homework assistance” to be provided is nonspecific; instructors will develop lesson plans “aligned with school-day learning standards.”
- Narrative indicates that all RLP students will receive “specifically-designed reading or math intervention” but no specific evidence-backed curriculum mentioned other than IXL for math.
- Instructors will develop most enrichment lesson plans; examples are varied but nonspecific (“community garden,” “play performances,” “fun math activities,”) and some would require specialized materials and staffing not indicated (e.g., “learn to play an instrument,” “boat building.”) It’s unclear how the offerings will be organized over time.
- Unclear whether specific family needs are identified at this time that would drive family engagement programming. Plan includes connecting families with existing relevant free community programming plus hosting fun family events like “family literacy and math nights.” First 10 Community Outreach Coordinator will help support families of kids ages PK-10.
- Several references to staff PD around safety are included, however, given the ample outdoor experiences planned, specific training around outdoor risk assessment and management may be warranted and is not directly mentioned.

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Wiscasset School Department
DATE: 4/16/25
EVALUATOR NAME: Lindsay Barrett
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

- Volunteers will augment paid staff and be recruited via community organizations; limited details about volunteer training.
- Intended outcomes for academic, health and wellness and enrichment are impactful. Particularly high four-year goals for NWEA and behavior improvement.

Program Evaluation

- A needs assessment will be administered to help guide program development and performance measures; staff will be offered professional development aligned to identified needs. (Aim to offer 48-64 hours of PD per staff member.)
- Quarterly reflections and assessments will track program effectiveness and drive responsive and immediate programming adjustments
- CLC will operate as an extension of the school system; evaluation results will be shared regularly to School Committee and written reports made public via district channels.

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

III. Budget Proposal

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

Budget Narrative & Forms

- Cost per RLP to participate is \$2686, aligning with the multi-site program maximum cost per student. This cost is comprehensive of staffing, enrichment/support and transportation.
- The narrative emphasizes resource sharing and optimization of other funding sources (Title 1, Child Nutrition Program, state funds for staff professional development in academic intervention and enrichment, school facilities, technology access and staffing support).
- Community organization involvement aimed at diversifying enrichment offerings without additional cost; contributions/programming agreements with specific partners not documented.
- Forms indicate in-kind contributions from school district to share program operating costs: Programming space at school buildings and Wiscasset Community Center (WCC), administrative support from WCC and school district. No indication on budget forms of school district fiscal contribution for 35% of transportation costs.

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Wiscasset School Department
DATE: 4/16/25
EVALUATOR NAME: Lindsay Barrett
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

- Funding from Community Health Improvement Grant referenced as an additional means to allow program to operate with no fees for the first year, but is not specified on budget forms.
- \$8710 for “various materials and supplies needed to support programming” does not include additional explanation or examples.
- Rationale not included for whether salary allocations are sufficient to retain staff with the expertise required to successfully perform duties outlined (e.g., place-based lesson design, academic intervention).

Capacity for Success & Sustainability

- Advisory board in place that includes a variety of stakeholders and perspectives.
- Numerous partner organizations bring the possibility for diverse resources at low/no cost. though
- Program will be no-cost for first year to encourage enrollment and accessibility, then may include sliding-scale fees.
- Specific commitments of partner organizations not outlined in the budget.
- Staffing by certified teachers/ed techs is a hallmark of their program model but sustainability plan indicates that shifting to leaning on volunteers, high school students, and college interns will be considered to reduce staffing costs in subsequent years.

Priority Points

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

- Poverty Level: Title 1 status referenced; district Free & Reduced Priced Lunch 48.39%.
- ESEA Status information not specified.
- No relevant information about other need specified.

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Wiscasset School Department
DATE: April 21, 2025
EVALUATOR NAME: Renee Felini
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Appendix A – Proposal Cover Page

- Ambitious proposal for a PreK-12 program with three sites
- Strong partnership between WSD and the Community Center (Parks & Rec)

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

- Signed, is the individual ‘a person authorized to enter into contracts on behalf of the Bidder’?

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

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

- Three sites (elementary, community center, middle/high school)
- Sites all plan 2 hrs/day (4 days/week), with elementary providing half hour before school in addition to 1.5 hours after school
- Will it be hard to meet 25 RLP in the elementary and community center (minimum required per site)?
- Estimated number of parents served assumes two parent households
- Strong list of partners which will aid sustainability goals

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Wiscasset School Department
DATE: April 21, 2025
EVALUATOR NAME: Renee Felini
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*

- Parent/guardian survey produced good information in regard to program need, 10% of surveys were returned
- Is there teacher buy-in for a prolonged work day?
- Student interest and strengths survey will help with planning and to ensure student voice/choice
- Available resources will support the success of programming
- Good communication plan
- Will the 'movement time' in the morning elementary school program be organized time or free time (recess)? Does before school care align with aims of the grant?
- Operation schedule and staff-to-youth ratios align with the RFP
- Good plan to guide program development and commitment to continual improvement
- Data sharing to aid community support

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

III. Budget Proposal

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

- No fees planned for first year of grant
- Good use of existing resources, funding, and community partnerships
- Hourly rate lower for program director?
- What is the district's contribution % for transportation (no in-kind listed on budget sheet, 35% minimum)?
- Good advisory board, consider having a community member/business partner not affiliated with sites
- Sustainability plan highlights diversified funding, community contributions, volunteer/intern support, and district/municipal support

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Wiscasset School Department
DATE: April 21, 2025
EVALUATOR NAME: Renee Felini
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Priority Points

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

- New program
- School and community partnership
- Sheepscot Valley Children's House
- Not exported from the proposal website, application exceeds 50 pages

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Wiscasset Public Schools
DATE: 4/21/25
EVALUATOR NAME: SARAH JORDAN
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Appendix A – Proposal Cover Page

- No comment

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

- No comment

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

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

- **A. Abstract:**
Strengths:
The application identifies the target population to serve students K-12 LP students at 3 sites with academic enrichment and exploratory opportunities. The application describes the program design and strategies to offer before and after school programming for academic interventions and enrichment and parent engagement with community partnerships.
- **b. Program Demographics:**
Strengths:
The application proposes to serve a total of 89 RLP students to be served annually and low-performing students.

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Wiscasset Public Schools
DATE: 4/21/25
EVALUATOR NAME: SARAH JORDAN
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

c.Partners:

Strengths:

The application identifies the lead community partner at Wiscasset Community Center and 11 additional community 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

- **1. Planning:**

Strengths:

The application identifies the planning process including a meeting timeline beginning in February 2025 based on school and student level data at the 3 target sites.

Need for Program:

Strengths:

The application demonstrated need for place-based learning and enrichment based on survey data with community involvement.

The application will address needs of LP students using strategies to increase connection with co-curricular activities.

Weakness:

The application does not clearly identify the academic needs of the target population using student/school data.

Program Design:

Strengths:

The application describes the activities proposed include enrichment and academic support and aligns with goals in Appendix D.

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Wiscasset Public Schools
DATE: 4/21/25
EVALUATOR NAME: SARAH JORDAN
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

The application describes a plan to attract and retain participants and LP students through existing school communication resources and program/school coordination.

The program proposes to collaborate with school day programs through Program staff/site coordinator and school staff collaboration/advisory structure to review and monitor data and program delivery.

The application proposes a staffing plan including hiring of existing school staff. The application demonstrates a plan to ensure safe and appropriate environments through clear policies, staff training and research based practices such as PBIS and community partners trauma-informed programming.

The application proposes student driven programming that is developmentally focused, project based and incorporates student interests and feedback.

In appendix D, the application includes clear strategies and activities relating to required academic improvement measurements and target outcomes as well as Health and Wellness, Educational enrichment, Family engagement and Sustainability/Collaboration.

The application proposes a diverse selection of community partners and their roles/contributions to the proposed program.

Program Management:

Strengths:

The application describes the Program Director FTE, role, desired training and experience and act as a bridge between school sites.

The application demonstrates a intent to collaborate with school staff data tracking and evaluation.

The application describes a plan for staff development based on best practices in youth development and academic support and ongoing coaching.

The application demonstrates a plan for program communication and outreach to include print and digital methods and staff communication protocols.

The application describes how transportation will be utilizing district resources.

The application describes how volunteers are coordinated thorough existing processes and recruited through community partners.

The application outlines how the program is aligned with the measures of effectiveness including use of comprehensive data, establishment of performance measures, evidence-based practices and data collection/analysis plan.

**STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
BIDDER NAME: Wiscasset Public Schools
DATE: 4/21/25
EVALUATOR NAME: SARAH JORDAN
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Education

The application describes an evaluation plan that will analyze progress quarterly and data collection methods that support continuous improvement. The advisory committee and Program Director will lead the evaluation. Periodic assessment will be ensured through analysis of key findings from assessment data and action plans for performance improvement.

Appendix C – Proposal Content & Budget

III. Budget Proposal

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

The proposed program budget and narrative is reasonable and aligns with program goals, meets requirements for cost per student. The application demonstrates a sustainability plan to strengthen partnerships between Wiscasset schools, community center and local resources to sustain the programming. Grants and fundraising efforts will be implemented.

Priority Points

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

- No comment



Janet T. Mills
Governor

STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Pender Makin
Commissioner

AGREEMENT AND DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

RFP #: 202412216

RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers

Lindsay Barrett

I, Lindsay Barrett 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.

Lindsay Barrett
Signature

3-18-25
Date



Janet T. Mills
Governor

STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Pender Makin
Commissioner

AGREEMENT AND DISCLOSURE STATEMENT
RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers

I, Renee Felini 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.



Signature

Date 3/19/25



Janet T. Mills
Governor

STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Pender Makin
Commissioner

AGREEMENT AND DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

RFP #: 202412216

RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers

Sarah Jordan

I, Sarah Jordan 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.

Signature

8-19-25

Date



Janet T. Mills
Governor

STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Pender Makin
Commissioner

AGREEMENT AND DISCLOSURE STATEMENT
RFP #: 202412216
RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers

I, Deborah Gilmer 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.

Signed by:

Deborah Gilmer

88B50528EA284C8

3/18/2025

Signature

Date



STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Janet T. Mills
Governor

Pender Makin
Commissioner

AGREEMENT AND DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

RFP #: 202412216

RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers

I, Jessica McPhail 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 F. McPhail
Signature

 3/18/2025
Date



STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Janet T. Mills
Governor

Pender Makin
Commissioner

AGREEMENT AND DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

RFP #: 202412216

RFP TITLE: 21st Century Community Learning Centers

Melinda Luders

I, _____ 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.



Signature



Date