

# 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers Program

21<sup>st</sup> CCLC Reviewer Scoring Report – Cohort 10



<b>Applicant Name:</b>	<b>Clinton County Family YMCA</b>
<b>Proposal Ranking:</b>	37
<b>Average Score</b>	107.1 / 125

## Proposal Strengths:

- The overall proposal has some strong areas to support getting a program up and running.
- The section that talked about the school system implementing Conscious Discipline was a really strong piece of your application. It had the potential to be the proverbial "north star" of your application and could have been a beautiful way to connect out of school time and the school day. The information on access to mental health services in Clinton County was also a very compelling aspect of your proposal. It articulated your unique need for SEL programming quite effectively and dramatically. The Y seems like the perfect organization to be providing these types of afterschool programs. You clearly have the facilities, the relationships within the community, and the visibility.
- The application demonstrates a history of success in youth service and a strong collaboration with schools and other community entities with shared vision. The application shows dedication to youth and a willingness to learn, grow and adapt should Clinton County Family YMCA be funded. The application shows an understanding of how to integrate and reinforce SEL competencies through activities like physical activity and STEM.

## Proposal Weaknesses:

- It is not clear if the applicant had meaningful and intentional collaboration with administrators from each school.
- Overall the application was missing the level of detail that would have made it strong. There wasn't a compelling use of data to make a case for the need for the program from the very beginning of the grant. It seemed like the addition of the program at The Crossing was an afterthought and there wasn't attention paid to the specific programming or curriculum that would be used for that aspect of the program. There were several things that just weren't explicitly stated that probably should have been like exactly where the programming would be occurring - it doesn't hurt to say it more than once. I got the impression that the authors were not aware of how explicit they needed to be in providing exact data points, specific recruitment strategies, and identifying the strategies for addressing potential transportation issues. Now that you have gone through the application process you will realize how important and essential these types of details are. Initially, I had a hard time seeing where the SEL components were when I first looked at your schedule - at first glance, it really looked like your program was going after the STEM priority area with CoderDojo and Scratch Coding. I had to go and look up CoderDojo to get more context and that shouldn't be the case. It

# 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers Program

21<sup>st</sup> CCLC Reviewer Scoring Report – Cohort 10



should be apparent in all of your narrative about how you are embedding your priority area into all aspects of your program. While I see some examples of Conscious Discipline strategies in your summer elementary schedule, there is no discussion of an SEL curriculum being implemented in the school year nor is it discussed in the narrative and that is problematic.

- The application sometimes missed details or opportunities to expand on a concept. There were some missteps in continuity and at times the focus of SEL either wasn't present or, on the other end of the spectrum, overshadowed any academic focus. Need was demonstrated related to poverty but academic need was not entirely clear. Program design missed some key points.

## Top Areas Where Points Were Lost:

- Safety and Transportation
- Program Communication
- Program Implementation
- Budget
- Program Design
- Need for Project