



California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office
Division of Workforce and Economic Development
K12 STRONG WORKFORCE PROGRAM
Application Narrative and Scoring Rubric

Section 1: Pathway Improvement Summary	NOT SCORED
<p>Summary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Populated from Letter of Intent (LOI): Pathway Improvement Name, Region, and Scope <p>Assurances</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Familiarity with Education Code Title 3, Division 7, Part 54.5 [88820-88833] and goals, terms, and conditions of the K12 SWP and requirements of grantees. • Alignment with 2019-20 LCAP. 	
Section 2: Lead & Partner Agencies	NOT SCORED
<p>Lead Agency/Partner Agencies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Includes: Lead and Partner Agency Name, Participating Schools, Total Average Daily Attendance, Rural School District, Financial Contribution, In-Kind Match, Description of In-Kind Match, Contacts 	

Section 3: Collaborative Partnerships

(Maximum Points: 5)

Collaborative Partnerships

- Describe how the collaborative partnerships with other entities will be leveraged for the Pathway Improvement. Explain the role(s) of the partner(s) and describe how the partnership(s) will make a difference for students. Please include entities such as business and industry, workforce development boards, community and philanthropic organizations, etc.
- Describe how matching resources from collaborative partners will be used and leveraged in the Pathway Improvement.

OUTSTANDING (5 points)

Extensive and/or varied partnerships that integrate and leverage available partner resources in the region, including a thorough description of roles, and how the partnership will make a difference for student outcomes; **well-articulated plan** for how matching resources from collaborative partner(s) will be used and leveraged in the Pathway Improvement.

STRONG (3–4 points)

Strong partnerships, good description of roles, and good description of impact for students; **clear plan** for how matching resources from collaborative partner(s) will be used and leveraged in the Pathway Improvement.

EMERGING (1–2 points)

Limited evidence of partnerships, vague description of roles, and limited description of impact on students; **limited plan** for how matching resources from collaborative partner(s) will be used and leveraged in the Pathway Improvement.

NO EVIDENCE (0 points)

No evidence of partnerships, roles, or impact on students; **no plan** for how matching resources from collaborative partner(s) will be used or leveraged in the Pathway Improvement.

Section 4: Statement of Need	(Maximum Points:10)
<p>Targeted Industry Sectors/Pathways</p> <p>Description of Need</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describe why the industry sector(s) and pathway(s) were selected, and explain the regional economic need using economic data and labor market information. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Demonstrate the connection between the selected industry sector(s) and pathway(s) to your regional economic needs by citing supporting information from your Career Technical Education Regional Consortia regional plan, California Community Colleges Centers of Excellence and/or Employment Development Department's Labor Market Information Division. <i>Applicants may upload documentation supporting the economic data and/or labor market information referenced here in the Supporting Documents section of the application.</i> • Describe the status of current Career Technical Education (CTE) courses, course sequences, programs, and/or pathways (or lack thereof) that will be addressed by the Pathway Improvement plan. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Explain why it is necessary to support or expand existing programs and/or create and implement new ones. 	<p>OUTSTANDING (8–10 points)</p> <p>Thorough and convincing rationale for why sector(s) and pathway(s) were selected, supported by economic data and labor market information provided by COE and/or CDE; thorough explanation of the status (or lack thereof) of current CTE courses, necessity to support programs, and how plan will address regional economic needs.</p> <hr/> <p>STRONG (5–7 points)</p> <p>Strong rationale for why sector(s) and pathway(s) were selected, supported by economic data and labor market information provided by COE and/or CDE; clear explanation of the status (or lack thereof) of current CTE courses, necessity to support programs, and how plan will address regional economic needs.</p> <hr/> <p>ADEQUATE (1–4 points)</p> <p>Adequate rationale for why sector(s) and pathway(s) were selected, supported by economic data and labor market information provided by COE and/or CDE; vague explanation of the status (or lack thereof) of current CTE courses, necessity to support programs, and how plan will address regional economic needs.</p> <hr/> <p>MINIMAL/INCOMPLETE (0 points)</p> <p>Missing or incomplete rationale for why sector(s) and pathway(s) were selected, no economic data or labor market information; no explanation of the status (or lack thereof) of current CTE courses, necessity to support programs, nor how plan will address regional economic needs.</p>

Section 5: Target Pupil	(Maximum Points: 10)
<p>Pupil Data/Program Type</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describe any special considerations associated with serving the targeted student population(s). Please include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ a thorough explanation of the challenge the LEA is trying to solve and how the proposed strategy will serve traditionally underserved and underrepresented pupils. ○ a description of how LEA-designated funding in the LCAP targets priorities of student subgroups, and how the application is aligned to it. 	<p>OUTSTANDING (9–10 points)</p> <p>Thorough and convincing description of challenge LEA is trying to solve, how proposed strategy will address, and how proposed strategy will serve traditionally underserved and underrepresented pupils. Thorough articulation of how LEA-designated funding in the LCAP targets priorities of student subgroups, and how the application is aligned to it.</p>
	<p>STRONG (6–8 points)</p> <p>Strong description of challenge LEA is trying to solve, how proposed strategy will address, and how proposed strategy will serve traditionally underserved and underrepresented pupils. Clear explanation of how LEA-designated funding in the LCAP targets priorities of student subgroups, and how the application is aligned to it.</p>
	<p>ADEQUATE (3–5 points)</p> <p>Adequate description of challenge LEA is trying to solve, how proposed strategy will address, and how proposed strategy will serve traditionally underserved and underrepresented pupils. Vague explanation of how LEA-designated funding in the LCAP targets priorities of student subgroups, and how the application is aligned to it.</p>
	<p>MINIMAL/INCOMPLETE (0–2 points)</p> <p>Missing or incomplete description of challenge LEA is trying to solve, how proposed strategy will address, or how proposed strategy will serve traditionally underserved and underrepresented pupils. No explanation of how LEA-designated funding in the LCAP targets priorities of student subgroups, or how the application is aligned to it.</p>

Section 6: Pathway Improvement Strategies	(Maximum Points: 25)
<p>Goals & Priorities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Describe how the application is informed by, aligned with, and expands upon the goals and priorities outlined in your Career Technical Education Regional Consortia regional plan (Valued at 10 points) Provide a detailed description of each of the strategies the application proposes to use in the Pathway Improvement plan. Include how each proposed strategy will address the statement of need. (Valued at 15 points) 	<p>OUTSTANDING (19–25 points)</p> <p>Thorough and convincing description that demonstrates the application is informed by, aligned with, and expands upon the goals and priorities outlined in their regional plan. Thorough articulation of how proposed strategy addresses the statement of need; thorough descriptions for each Pathway Improvement strategy.</p>
	<p>STRONG (12–18 points)</p> <p>Strong description that demonstrates the application is informed by, aligned with, and expands upon the goals and priorities outlined in their regional plan. Strong description of how proposed strategy addresses the statement of need; strong descriptions of each Pathway Improvement strategy.</p>
	<p>ADEQUATE (5–11 points)</p> <p>Adequate description of how the application is informed by, aligned with, and expands upon the goals and priorities outlined in their regional plan. Adequate description of how proposed strategy addresses the statement of need; adequate descriptions for each Pathway Improvement strategy.</p>
	<p>MINIMAL/INCOMPLETE (0–4 points)</p> <p>Missing or incomplete description of how the application is informed by, aligned with, or expands upon the goals and priorities outlined in their regional plan. No description of how proposed strategy addresses the statement of need; missing or incomplete descriptions for Pathway Improvement strategy(ies).</p>

Section 7: Statement of Work	(Maximum Points: 25)
<p>Activity(ies) For each proposed activity, provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ a description of the activity, ○ a description of how each activity addresses the statement of need, ○ the associated K12 SWP metric(s), ○ performance outcomes, ○ implementation or student engagement timeline, ○ responsible person(s), and ○ evidence that the activity demonstrates a complimentary and collaborative relationship that will help build the course pathway. 	<p>OUTSTANDING (19–25 points)</p> <p>Thorough and convincing descriptions of activities and how they address their statement of need; thorough articulation of performance outcomes, timeline, and responsible person(s); thorough and convincing evidence that proposed activities will help build the course pathway.</p>
	<p>STRONG (12–18 points)</p> <p>Strong descriptions of activities and how they address their statement of need; strong description of performance outcomes, timeline, and responsible person(s); strong description of how proposed activities will help build the course pathway.</p>
	<p>ADEQUATE (5–11 points)</p> <p>Adequate descriptions of activities and how they address their statement of need; adequate description of performance outcomes, timeline, and responsible person(s); adequate description of how proposed activities will help build the course pathway.</p>
	<p>MINIMAL/INCOMPLETE (0–4 points)</p> <p>Missing or incomplete descriptions of activities and how they address their statement of need; missing or incomplete descriptions of performance outcomes, timeline, or responsible person(s); missing or incomplete description of how proposed activities will help build the course pathway.</p>

Section 8: Capability & Sustainability	(Maximum Points: 15)	
<p>Capability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Describe how the Pathways Improvement grant will be directed and implemented. Include information on the project management roles and responsibilities of the lead LEA and partner LEAs, if applicable. Describe the lead applicant's experience in conducting and administering state-funded projects. Include the applicant's ability to ensure the reliable management of grant funds and to report on financial and pupil performance data. Include the applicant's plan to mitigate risks to pathways improvement success and ensure proper audit procedures. Describe applicant's experience collaborating successfully with multiple partners and/or stakeholders. Include how the applicant plans to structure coordination between partners/stakeholders to leverage capacity and expertise and ensure that grant goals are met. Describe how the proposed pathway improvement plan will leverage existing funding sources. <p>Sustainability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Describe how the LEA will utilize existing programs, partnerships, and resources to create sustainable pathway improvement(s). Include how the proposed Pathway Improvement plan leverages existing LEA structures, requirements, and resources of Perkins, the California Partnership Academies, workforce development boards or the Agricultural Career Technical Education Incentive Grant. 	<p>OUTSTANDING (13–15 points)</p> <p>Thorough and well-articulated plan for management and clear articulation of roles and responsibilities of the lead LEA and partners; extensive experience administering and managing state-funded projects and collaborating with multiple stakeholders. Thorough and convincing articulation of how the LEA will utilize existing programs, partnerships, and resources to create sustainable pathway improvement(s).</p>	
	<p>STRONG (9–12 points)</p> <p>Strong plan for management and clear roles and responsibilities for the lead LEA and partners; experience administering and managing state-funded projects and collaborating with multiple stakeholders. Strong description of how the LEA will utilize existing programs, partnerships, and resources to create sustainable pathway improvement(s).</p>	
	<p>ADEQUATE (4–8points)</p> <p>Adequate plan for management and description of roles and responsibilities for the lead LEA and partners; limited experience administering and managing state-funded projects and collaborating with multiple stakeholders. Adequate description of how the LEA will utilize existing programs, partnerships, and resources to create sustainable pathway improvement(s).</p>	
	<p>MINIMAL/INCOMPLETE (0–3points)</p> <p>Missing or incomplete plan for management or roles and responsibilities for the lead LEA and partners; missing or no experience administering and managing state-funded projects and collaborating with multiple stakeholders. Missing or incomplete description of how the LEA will utilize existing programs, partnerships, and resources to create sustainable pathway improvement(s).</p>	

Section 9: Pathway Improvement Budget	(Maximum Points: 10)	
<p>Match Summary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Depending on the type of Lead Agency for the application, applicants must provide matching funds in the amount of \$1 in match for every \$1 of grant funds requested (for regional occupational centers or programs operated by a joint powers authority or county office of education only) or \$2 in match for every \$1 of grant funds requested (for all other LEA types). Match totals may exceed the amount of grant funds requested. <p>Grant Funds Budget</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide a budget, by object code, that shows how the grant funds will be distributed based on a 30-month spending period. Reference the funding levels specified in the Request for Applications to determine the amount that may be requested. Provide a detailed description of planned expenditures by object code. 	<p>OUTSTANDING (8–10 points)</p> <p>Thorough and convincing indication that applicant will commit matching funds in the amount of \$1 in match for every \$1 of grant funds requested (for regional occupational centers or programs operated by a joint powers authority or county office of education only) or \$2 in match for every \$1 of grant funds requested (for all other LEA types); thorough articulation of how the grant funds will be distributed based on a 30-month spending period.</p> <p>STRONG (5–7 points)</p> <p>Strong indication that applicant will commit matching funds in the amount of \$1 in match for every \$1 of grant funds requested (for regional occupational centers or programs operated by a joint powers authority or county office of education only) or \$2 in match for every \$1 of grant funds requested (for all other LEA types); strong description of how the grant funds will be distributed based on a 30-month spending period.</p> <p>ADEQUATE (1–4 points)</p> <p>Adequate indication that applicant will commit matching funds in the amount of \$1 in match for every \$1 of grant funds requested (for regional occupational centers or programs operated by a joint powers authority or county office of education only) or \$2 in match for every \$1 of grant funds requested (for all other LEA types); adequate description of how the grant funds will be distributed based on a 30-month spending period.</p> <p>MINIMAL/INCOMPLETE (0 points)</p> <p>Missing or unclear plan for how applicant will commit matching funds in the amount of \$1 in match for every \$1 of grant funds requested (for regional occupational centers or programs operated by a joint powers authority or county office of education only) or \$2 in match for every \$1 of grant funds requested (for all other LEA types); no description of how the grant funds will be distributed.</p>	

Section 10: Supporting Documents	NOT SCORED
Upload copies of any documentation that will support your application.	

K12 SWP Application Assessment for Reviewers

Review Summary

Each application will be given a final score based on the average of each reviewer's score. Once submitted, your review will be accessible to all members of the Selection Committee.

Comprehensive Score

90/100 Points (example)

Final Comments

Assessment

1. Is there evidence in the application that it will align with programs that serve traditionally underserved and underrepresented pupils (i.e., English learners, foster youth, and free and reduced-price lunch subgroups):
 - Yes
 - No
2. Does this application serve pupils with higher than average dropout rates according to the "Target Pupil" section of the application?
 - Yes
 - No
3. Are the Lead LEA and/or any of the partner LEAs located in an area of the state with a high unemployment rate? Please refer to the LEA Characteristics List to determine if any of the LEAs are in a high unemployment area.
 - Yes
 - No
4. Does the Lead LEA and/or any of the partner LEAs operate within rural school districts? Please select "Yes" if the Lead LEA has indicated that it is in a rural school district in the "Lead & Partner Agencies" section. If not, please refer to the LEA Characteristics List to check if any of the partner LEAs are in rural school districts.
 - Yes
 - No

5. How well does the application meet the needs of its local and regional economy as articulated in the CTE Regional Consortia regional plan?
 - 5-Extremely
 - 4-Very
 - 3-Moderately
 - 2-Slightly
 - 1-Not at all

6. How well does the application leverage existing structures for funding (i.e., Perkins, Partnership Academies Program, or Agricultural Career Technical Education Incentive, Strong Workforce Program at the Community College level)?
 - 5-Extremely
 - 4-Very
 - 3-Moderately
 - 2-Slightly
 - 1-Not at all

7. How well does the application include and leverage contributions from collaborative partners (i.e., industry, labor, philanthropic sources)?
 - 5-Extremely
 - 4-Very
 - 3-Moderately
 - 2-Slightly
 - 1-Not at all

8. To what extent does the application make investments in CTE infrastructure, equipment, and facilities?
 - 5-A great extent
 - 4-Considerable
 - 3- Moderate
 - 2-Slight
 - 1-Not at all

Budget Follow Up

Requested Budget \$[*amount requested in application*]

Is requested budget amount adequate?

Identify if the requested budget amount is adequate or if you'd consider a higher/lesser amount. If considering a higher/lesser amount, please specify.

Considering funding for higher/lesser amount \$[*amount proposed by reviewer*]

Adequate Amount

Undecided

Requested budget amount comments