

A total of 100 quality points are available based on the relative merit of the evaluation.

**Applicant: \_­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Reader #: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **I. PROGRAM REPORT**  **d. ehcy pROGRAM eVALUATION**  **D-1 Description of Authorized Activities**  **MAXIMUM 10 POINTS**  **Points Awarded:** | | |
| **Ideal Indicator** | **Evaluation** | Reviewer’s comments |
| Detailed description of the reasoning (e.g. deficiencies in student achievement data, asset shortages, survey of expressed needs) that led to the implemented authorized activities carried out under this program as proposed in the original grant application for funding. | **Meets expectations – 5-10 points**   * A detailed description for the reasoning that led to the implemented authorized activities carried out in the original grant application is provided.   **Did not meet expectations – 1-4 points**   * A narrative for the reasoning that led to the implemented authorized activities in the original grant application is provided, but the reasoning is vague and/or does not apply to the identified activities.   **Applicant did not provide a response – 0 points** |  |
| Justification for assigned score: | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **I. PROGRAM REPORT**  **d. ehcy pROGRAM eVALUATION**  **D-2 Overall Evaluation of the EHCY Grant**  **MAXIMUM 15 POINTS**  **Points Awarded:** | | |
| **Ideal Indicator** | **Evaluation** | Reviewer’s comments |
| A detailed description of the overall success or lack of success in implementation of the previous school year’s EHCY grant implementation. | **Meets expectations – 10-15 points**   * A detailed description of success or lack of success of the original grant proposal is provided including all of the following:   + Identification of areas that were particularly successful and detailed rationale for the success.   + Identification of areas that were not successful and detailed rationale for the lack of success.   + Identification of challenges experienced in implementation, coordination, and/or administration and how the challenges were resolved.   + Identification of the efforts to address the most frequently identified barriers indicated in the original previous school year’s EHCY grant application.   **Does not meet expectations – 1-9 points**   * A description of success or lack of success is provided, but some descriptions are vague and/or do not address the following:   + Identification of areas that were particularly successful and detailed rationale for the success.   + Identification of areas that were not successful and detailed rationale for the lack of success.   + Identification of challenges experienced in implementation, coordination, and/or administration and how the challenges were resolved.   **Applicant did not provide a response - 0 points** |  |
| Justification for assigned score: | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **II. FY15 EHCY Grant CONTINUATION REQUEST**  **A. Continuation Activities**  **A-1 Review and Reassess Needs**  **MAXIMUM 15 POINTS**  **Points Awarded:** | | |
| **Ideal Indicator** | **Evaluation** | Reviewer’s comments |
| Clearly described the process that has been used to review and reassess the needs of the homeless children and youth in their LEA and how that has impacted the identification of services for the FY15 continuation grant year. | **Meets expectations- 10-15 points**   * A detailed summary of the process used to review and reassess the needs of the homeless children and youth in their district is provided. * Clear and detailed information as to how this information has impacted the identification of services for the FY15 continuation grant is provided.   **Does not meet expectations-1-9 points**   * A summary of the process used to review and reassess the needs of the homeless children and youth in their district is provided but lacks clarity and/or specific details. * Required information as to how this information has impacted the identification of services for the FY15 continuation grant is provided but is vague and unclear in parts.   **Applicant did not provide a response-0 points** |  |
| Justification for assigned score: | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **II. FY15 EHCY GRANT Continuation Activities**  **A. Continuation Activities**  **A-2 Proposed Grant Continuation Activities**  **MAXIMUM 10 POINTS**  **Points Awarded:** | | |
| **Ideal Indicator** | **Evaluation** | Reviewer’s comments |
| Description of the current activities to be continued, including any changes in them, and the plan for any new or additional activity (ies) proposed for the FY15 continuation grant year. | **Meets expectations – 5-10 points**   * A detailed plan with clearly written examples of the continued activities from the district’s original grant proposal, including any changes to them, is provided. * Detailed information with clearly written strategies describing new or additional activities to be implemented during the FY15 EHCY continuation grant is provided.   **Did not meet expectations – 1-4 points**   * A plan that lacks clarity and/or does not fully address the original activities, or describe new or additional activities.   **Applicant did not provide a response – 0 points**. |  |
| Justification for assigned score: | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **FY15 EHCY Grant Continuation Request**   **B. Proposed Program Coordination Activities**  **MAXIMUM 20 POINTS**  **Points Awarded:** | | |
| **Ideal Indicator** | **Evaluation** | Reviewer’s comments |
| A detailed description of the current program coordination activities to be continued, including any changes to be done, and the plan for any new or additional coordination activities proposed for the FY15 continuation grant year.  The narrative includes the individuals, agencies and programs to be involved and the nature of the involvement of each.  Description of the process to evaluate the coordinating agencies’ services and the process to be used to evaluate those services for the FY15 continuation grant year  A detailed description of the coordination of the homeless program with Title I Part A services is also addressed. | **Meets expectations- 10-20 points**   * A detailed description of the homeless program’s agency community coordination plan that will be continued, including programs and resources offered and how they will meet the needs of homeless children and youth is provided. * A detailed evaluation plan to evaluate the quality and effectiveness of the coordinating agencies’ services and how the evaluation will be conducted is provided. * A detailed description of the coordination of the homeless program with Title I Part A services is provided.   **Does not meet expectations- 1-9 points**   * A description of the homeless program’s agency community coordination plan that will be continued, including programs and resources offered and how they will meet the needs of homeless children and youth is provided but is not well documented and/or lacks clarity. * An evaluation plan to evaluate the quality and effectiveness of the coordinating agency’s services for FY15 and how the evaluation is conducted is provided, but lacks clarity and/or sufficient information. * A description of the coordination of the homeless program with Title I Part A services is provided but does not provide specific examples of coordination activities.   **Applicant did not provide a response – 0 points** |  |
| Justification for assigned score: | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **FY15 EHCY Grant Continuation Request**   **c. fiscal responsibility**  **C-1 Proposed Budget Narrative for the FY15 continuation grant funding**  **MAXIMUM 20 POINTS**  **Points Awarded:** | | |
| **Ideal Indicator** | **Evaluation** | Reviewer’s comments |
| A detailed budget narrative that clearly explains the expenditures anticipated for the FY15 grant year is provided. Each expenditure must be related to the grant application and supported by the most recent needs assessment. | **Meets expectations – 10-20 points**   * A clearly detailed narrative of all proposed expenditures for the FY15 grant year is provided. * The narrative relates all expenditures to the grant plan and/or supports the expenditures with the most recent needs assessment of the homeless children and youth to be served.   **Does not meet expectations – 1-9 points.**   * The narrative of all proposed expenditures for the FY15 grant year is provided but lacks detail and clarity. * Some expenditures are related to the grant application and/or supported by the most recent needs assessment of the homeless children and youth to be served but are vague or are not addressed at all.   **Applicant did not provide a response – 0 points.** |  |
| Justification for assigned score: | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **II. FY14 EHCY Grant Continuation Request**  **C. FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY**  **C-2 Proposed Budget Summary and Schedule of Expenses for FY15 Grant Request**  **MAXIMUM 10 POINTS**    **Points Awarded:** | | |
| **Ideal Indicator** | **Evaluation** | Reviewer’s comments |
| Budget Summary and Detail pages for EHCY continuation grant funding for FY15 with function and object codes in accordance with McKinney-Vento funds and the State’s Chart of Accounts are provided. | **Meets expectations – 6-10 points**   * A projected budget summary with appropriately described and placed expenditures on the detail pages as described in the State Chart of Accounts is provided.   **Does not meet expectations – 1-5 points.**   * A projected budget summary with expenditures on the detail pages is provided but some detailed descriptions are not provided and/or some items are not appropriately placed according to the State Chart of Accounts.   **Applicant did not provide a response – 0 points.** |  |
| Justification for assigned score: | | |