



**Title II Formula Grant Program
Title II Issue Paper
March 16 & 17, 2022**

This Issue Paper is presented to the Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC) Title II Grant Program Executive Steering Committee (ESC) as a guide to the development of the Request for Proposals (RFP). The purpose of this document is to guide a meaningful and focused discussion on key topics and related decision points that will help the ESC develop an RFP to present to the BSCC Board on June 10, 2022.

As the group moves through the Issue Paper, staff will be listening to the discussion and taking notes. It is likely that some issues will generate more discussion than others; however, it is not necessary to reach a consensus on every issue. Staff will attempt to identify issues that remain outstanding at the end of the meeting and suggest next steps. Staff will incorporate decisions made and priorities discussed within a draft RFP. As part of this ESC process, staff will lead the ESC in the development of the rating criteria which will be used to score the proposals.

Funding Authority: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP)

Funding Amount: Amounts for FFY 2021, FFY 2022 and FFY 2023 are not yet known. All funding is contingent upon California receiving FFY 2021, 2022 and 2023 awards.

Grant Award Period: January 1, 2023 to December 31, 2026. This issue paper assumes a three-year grant cycle, consistent with the length of the OJJDP required 3-year state plan.

Background: The Juvenile Justice Reform Act (JJRA) of 2018 is the federal statute that establishes the Title II Formula Grant Program that supports states with delinquency prevention and intervention and the enhancement of the effectiveness and efficiency of the juvenile justice system. More specifically, it supports State and local efforts in planning, operating, and evaluating projects that seek to prevent at-risk youth from entering the juvenile justice system or intervene with first-time and non-serious offenders to provide services that maximize their chances of leading productive, successful lives. The federal Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) administers the Title II Formula Grant program through an application and planning process, California receives annual Title II grant funding from the OJJDP. The BSCC must competitively award most of these funds to local governments consistent with the purpose and intent of the JJRA and California's Title II State Plan.

The State Advisory Committee on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (SACJJDP) developed California's Title II 2021-2023 State Plan and it was approved by the Board and submitted to OJJDP and subsequently approved. This grant program will fulfill the goals and objectives of the State Plan and JJRA requirements.

Issues for Discussion

Issues for discussion are below; however, the ESC does not need to take these issues in documented order. Some issues are interconnected across sections and may require members to pause one issue to have a more in-depth conversation on a corresponding issue in another section.

Sections for guiding RFP development

A. Target Population	Page 8
B. Applicant Eligibility	Page 9
C. Pass-Through Funding	Page 11
D. Funding Considerations	Page 13
E. Promising, Data-Driven, and Innovative Approaches	Page 15
F. Racial and Ethnic Disparity (R.E.D.)	Page 17
G. Data Collection and Evaluation	Page 18
H. Administrative	Page 19
I. Rating Criteria and Factors	Page 21

GUIDING PRINCIPLES ESTABLISHED FOR TITLE II PROGRAM RFP

This Title II Grant Program intends to promote youth safety and well-being while in custody and identify and support successful and emerging reentry models/. It intends that in-custody programs focus on rehabilitation and building individual strengths instead of punishment for past mistakes and deficits. It intends that California's disproportionate representation of youth of color in the juvenile justice system be addressed. Funded programs should be:

- Consistent with the Title II 2021-2023 State Plan
- Promising, data-driven, and innovative
- Individualized case plans that are family-based
- Culturally responsive
- Locally relevant, and
- Offer measurable outcomes.

PROGRAM PURPOSE AREAS

The State Advisory Committee on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (SACJJDP) has determined that the funds will be used to support the following Program Purpose areas:

Aftercare/Reentry

Working from the premise that any youth is capable of success if given support and assistance, aftercare/reentry services need to focus on individual strengths, personal growth, and building resiliency. During incarceration, youth miss out on the normal maturation process and struggle to overcome the stigma of serving time, necessitating help to navigate new systems once they are released. Currently, there are insufficient options and resources that youth can access to get their basic needs met, including employment and housing. Consequently, there is a need for models and examples they can follow for how to build a quality life. This includes assistance by capable mentors and availability of appropriate community-based services. The barriers faced by formerly incarcerated youth trying to access needed services and opportunities, such as mental health, employment, education, housing, and professional development, must be broken down and these support systems need to be introduced while youth are incarcerated as opposed to when they get out of detention.

The SACJJDP Juvenile crime analysis shows significant recidivism, supporting the need for more and/or better aftercare programs and services to assist youth in successful transitions back to their communities.

Goal: Ensure that youth, upon entering a secure detention facility, are informed about and engaged in developing a robust reentry plan. This should be part of a comprehensive case planning process that addresses the most critical needs of the individual and provides a broad array of services.

Objectives:

1. Increase the number of youths in custodial settings with individual case plans in place that incorporate robust reentry models.
2. Identify and support successful and emerging aftercare/reentry models.
3. Examine strategies to incentivize successful reentry programs that also address basic needs such as housing, employment, and mental health care.
4. Increase the number of case plans, including reentry components, that consider the youth's environment and rely on collaboration with families and local support systems; and
5. Educate the public about the importance of affording youth a second chance.

Activities and Services: Through participation in aftercare/reentry programs, a greater number of youths exiting the justice system will participate in programs designed to improve positive youth behavior and increase public safety without exposing youth to unnecessary restriction. Partnerships among probation or an agency within the jurisdiction, as well as with local service providers including schools, community-based organizations, counseling/therapy providers, local businesses, and faith-based organizations are necessary for successful implementation. Resilience will be fostered by offering youth support to achieve successful rehabilitation and reintegration into their communities. Holistic and collaborative approaches will be employed as social, psychological, and emotional care and literacy are nurtured. Support will be afforded through organizations dedicated to formerly incarcerated and vulnerable youth, especially those offering mentorship and specific guidance around not just 'what to do' but more specifically how to do it.

Alternatives to Detention and Placement

In some situations, youth are detained due to a lack of alternatives or to receive services that are otherwise unavailable (e.g., housing). There is a lack of programs to address the issues that prompt low level criminal conduct, involve behavioral modification, offer counselling and family support, and foster collaboration between courts/probation and community-based organizations. Detention partially due to a lack of available resources for non-arrest alternatives.

Goal: Reduce the number of youths held in secure detention.

Objectives:

1. Expand the use of and increase the options for alternatives to detention and placement.
2. Increase awareness regarding the detrimental effect of incarceration on youth.
3. Build strategic local partnerships that will serve to increase the awareness and use of effective alternatives to detention and placement; and
4. Create a vehicle for community-based, self-esteem-building and healing-centered alternatives to detention and placement.

Activities and Services: Through participation in alternatives to detention programs, a greater number of youths coming into contact with the juvenile justice system will participate in programs designed to improve positive youth behavior and increase public safety without exposing youth to unnecessary restriction. In looking at solutions, community-based and community-run alternatives are an underutilized option for addressing the vast majority of youthful offender behaviors that lie outside the parameters of public safety and/or flight risk. Partnerships among probation or an agency within the jurisdiction, as well as with local service providers including schools, community-based organizations, counseling/therapy providers, local businesses, and faith-based organizations are necessary for successful implementation. Partnerships will focus on providing alternatives that are strength-based and healing-centered, that rely on youth empowerment to build on individual strengths while fostering success. Opportunities will be developed to create alternatives for victims of human trafficking, foster youth, and others who end up in detention because they have nowhere else to go. Awareness will be raised regarding the trauma caused to youth who are detained, the high costs of detention, the reality that a high percentage of mentally ill youth are in custody, including severe cases, and the data showing that detention results in higher recidivism rates, does not address R.E.D. and leaves youth with a label that once embraced, changes their self-identity and ability to assimilate.

Community Based Programs and Services

Programs that are locally based, culturally relevant, and collaborative in nature provide greater accessibility and can be more tailored to individual needs. In turn, such programs also present the best opportunity for youth to succeed. The need for these programs is supported by the numbers of juvenile arrests, referrals and bookings.

Goal: Increase the availability of, and access to, community-based programs and services that help youth, and their families, who are at risk of entering the juvenile justice system or have already entered the system.

Objectives:

1. Increase access to community-based support programs and services for youth, parents, and families.
2. Promote community-defined success through effective and culturally relevant evaluation strategies and policies.
3. Expand cultural and linguistic services for youth, parents, and families; and
4. Foster collaboration between community-based providers and justice system agencies including law enforcement, probation, and the courts.

Activities and Services: Provide support for making community-based services convenient for those who most need them. Look for opportunities to provide wrap around services including having one-stop shops with social workers, nurses, interviewers, etc. on site. Make these services culturally and linguistically accessible to a wide clientele including individuals with limited English language skills. Provide assistance with locating, obtaining and/or maintaining housing, employment, after school programs, and mental health services.

Diversion

Youth in custody experience trauma and start to identify with other system impacted youth and embrace anti-social peer mentality, making it critically important to avoid the initial incidence of detention. All other options should be exhausted prior to detention and detention should never be accepted as a default response due to lack of other resources. Once a youth comes into contact with the juvenile justice system, recidivism rates go up and youth protective factors start to diminish.

California's juvenile arrest data shows a high number of juvenile arrests, referrals and sustained petitions, which suggests that more opportunities for diversion could be beneficial.

Goal: Increase the number of youths diverted from the juvenile justice system.

Objectives:

1. Increase the availability and use of diversion practices and programs.
2. Use evidence-based assessments that increase objectivity and reduce implicit bias in decision making, and
3. Expand awareness and resources for effective non-arrest alternatives, including restorative justice programs, that teach youth to accept responsibility for their actions.

Activities and Services: Through participation in diversion programs, a greater number of at-risk youths will participate in programs designed to improve positive youth behavior and increase public safety without having them enter into the juvenile justice system. Partnerships amongst and between agencies including probation medical and mental health providers, schools, community-based organizations, counseling/therapy providers, local businesses, and faith-based organizations are necessary for successful implementation. Such partnerships would focus on development of programs and services that use behavioral modification, social constraints, or restorative justice to address the issues that prompted the low-level criminal conduct first bringing a youth into contact with law enforcement. Other critical components of these partnerships include involving families, addressing R.E.D. concerns, providing for the measurement of outcomes, and being locally based, collaborative, culturally relevant, and affording a linguistic component. The focus would be on getting youth to complete programs that emphasize accountability and life skills development over arrest and/or incarceration.

Mentoring, Counseling and Training

Healthy youth development is supported by the presence and involvement of positive role models. Similarly, growth and development can best occur in an environment where youth are provided opportunities to connect with positive adults, obtain support and encouragement around education and employment, receive counseling and other support services as needed, and gain exposure to new experiences and opportunities. These types of youth development programs are critically important to slow the trend of juvenile arrests, referrals, and sustained petitions,

Goal: Promote mentoring, counseling, and training programs that enhance resilience and empower youth.

Objectives:

1. Increase mentor recruitment and development to foster more mentor-mentee matches.
2. Expand opportunities for youth to participate in drug and violence prevention counseling; and
3. Increase vocational and technical training opportunities.

Activities and Services: Mentorship can play a critical role in keeping youth out of the juvenile justice system and funding should be provided to support additional resources and training for new mentors. In addition, the time is right to explore the use of peer mentors to help youth navigate the juvenile justice system. Efforts in this area should include working with providers such as career/technical education programs to develop apprenticeships, engage prospective employers and facilitate job placement and training. In addition, youth need opportunities to receive assistance with a variety of life skills. This could range from providing counseling in the areas of parenting and building healthy relationships to training youth to find housing, employment and other needed assistance.

Job Training

Providing job training services is an effective strategy to dissuade delinquency and system involvement for at-risk youth; particularly those out of school and in high-risk situations. The SACJJDP intends to support employment training programs for at-risk youth that prepare participants for employment, provide mentorship and other support services, provide job placements, and make resources available to assist participants retain employment. This comprehensive approach requires collaboration among community-based organizations and employment service agencies. SACJJDP will support projects that enhance the employability of youth or prepare them for future employment by supporting the collaboration between community-based organizations that provide mentorship and agencies that provide job training and job placement services such as: advocacy centers, educational institutions, and workforce investment boards.

Goal: Incorporate projects that enhance the employability of youth and prepare them for future employment and provide job training and placement services.

Objectives:

1. Enhance collaborate between community-based organizations and service providers to provide job training services for youth and job placement services.

Activities and Services:

Collaborate with agencies that provide job training and mentorship programs and bridge communication gaps within job training and job placement providers like advocacy centers, educational institutions, workforce boards and potential employers. Such programs shall include activities like job readiness training, apprenticeships, vocational training, job referrals, and occupational skills training.

A. TARGET POPULATION

❖ **ESC DECISION POINTS.** Discuss, consider and make decisions on the following:

What population is eligible to receive program services?

Discussion:

The JJRA of 2018 identifies juveniles under the age of 18 but allows for services to those who may still be in contact with the juvenile justice system (i.e., custody or probation).

Recommendation:

The target population for the Title II Grant Program are people who have been under the jurisdiction of the juvenile court and who are under age of 26.

NOTES:

B. APPLICANT ELIGIBILITY

❖ **ESC DECISION POINTS.** Discuss, consider, and make decisions on the following:

Who is eligible to apply for these funds?

Discussion:

Funds may be awarded to units of local government; private nonprofit agencies, organizations, or institutions; or Federally recognized Indian Tribes.

Recommendation:

Applicants for Title II Grant Program awards must be one of the following:

1. Units of local government (including individual agencies or departments within a City and County or a School District);
2. Private nonprofit agencies, organizations, or institutions; or
3. Federally recognized Indian tribes.

NOTES:

❖ ESC DECISION POINTS. Discuss, consider, and make decisions on the following:

Can one applicant submit more than one proposal?

- BSCC typically limits applicants to one due to the logistics of rating and screening. One application also allows applicant to internally set priorities.

Can applicants collaborate to submit a joint proposal?

- If so, there will need to be a “lead’ applicant.

Should there be a single proposal funding cap?

Discussion:

There may be multiple departments within a unit of government interested in applying for funding. There also may be projects that are partnerships between units of government. These partnerships could include rural units of governments applying as one applicant or partnerships among multiple departments of a large unit of government.

Recommendation:

Two or more applicants may partner to submit a joint proposal, but one must be designated as Lead Agency for contracting purposes. An applicant may not apply as Lead Agency for more than one proposal.

Non-lead agencies (including NGOs) may serve as a partner on more than one proposal. All NGOs must meet the eligibility criteria in Appendix C, “Criteria for Non-governmental Organizations Receiving Title II Grant Program Funds”.

NOTES

C. PASS-THROUGH FUNDING

❖ **ESC DECISION POINTS.** Discuss, consider, and make decisions on the following:

Does this ESC want to require a mandatory pass-through percentage, and if so, what should be the pass-through percentage?

Discussion:

The OJJDP does not require subrecipient city or county local governments to pass-through funding to non-governmental community organizations. The BSCC, by documented assurances, requires any non-governmental, community organization that receives grant funds to:

- Have been duly organized, in existence, and in good standing six months prior to the release of the RFP (non-governmental organizations that have recently reorganized or have merged with other qualified non-governmental organizations that were in existence prior to release of the RFP are also eligible provided all necessary agreements have been executed and filed with the California Secretary of State prior to the start date of the grant agreement
- Be registered with the California Secretary of State's Office, if applicable;
- Have a valid business license, Employer Identification Number (EIN), and/or Taxpayer ID (if sole proprietorship);
- Have any other state or local licenses or certifications necessary to provide the services requested (e.g., facility licensing by the Department of Health Care Services), if applicable.
- Have a physical address.
- Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) include: community-based organizations (CBOs), faith-based organizations (FBOs), non-profit organizations/501(c)(3)s, evaluators (except government institutions such as universities), grant management companies and any other non-governmental agency or individual. Note: These criteria do not apply to government organizations (e.g. counties, cities, school districts, etc.).

Recommendation:

Lead applicant government agencies or Indian Tribes are required to pass through a minimum of 70% of grant funding to at least one direct service provider. An Indian Tribe can satisfy the pass-through requirement if the Indian Tribe provides direct services. A direct service provider can be a non-governmental organization.

For purposes of the pass-through requirement, pass-through NGOs include community-based organizations (CBOs), faith-based organizations (FBOs), non-profit organizations/501(c)(3)s, evaluators (except government institutions such as universities), grant management companies and any other non-governmental agency or individual. Note: The NGO criteria does not apply to government organizations (e.g., counties, cities, school districts, or federally recognized Indian tribes).

NOTES:

D. FUNDING CONSIDERATIONS

❖ **ESC DECISION POINTS.** Discuss, consider and make decisions on the following:

How should the funding be allocated to ensure equitable distribution?

Should there be a minimum or maximum funding amount per proposal?

SACJJDP did not require match in last program, should a “match” be required?

Discussion:

The total funds available for the Title II grant program average \$4,000,000 per year, though the funding level is unknown at this time.

Recommendation:

Successful applicants will be funded subject to California receiving federal Title II funding for the next (3) three years. In addition to this funding contingency, funding is contingent upon adherence to federal guidelines, Title II RFP and BSCC grant agreement requirements and applicable statutes, and the grantee’s ability to demonstrate that progress is being made towards its proposal goals and objectives.

\$4,000,000 is anticipated to be available statewide for the first year of the grant cycle. Funding and amounts for the second year (January 1, 2024 - December 31, 2024) and the third year (January 1, 2025 – December 31, 2025) are contingent on OJJDP Title II awards and amounts not yet known.

The maximum amount of funding available per grant annually is \$350,000. Applicants must apply for the same amount of funding for all three years (e.g., first year: \$350,000, second year: \$350,000, and third year: \$350,000; totaling \$1,050,000 for a three-year period). Grantees may be able to carry unspent funds into the next calendar year, with prior BSCC approval, but it is extremely important that applicants plan and budget carefully and apply only for the amount of funding they can reasonably spend each year of the three-year grant period.

Applicants are required to request only the amount of funds needed to support their proposal and not base the request solely on the maximum allowed annually (\$350,000).

Funding Distribution & Funding Thresholds

Applicants must receive at least 66% of the total points available to be considered for funding. These eligible applicants will compete in one category. However, as described below, funding shall be prioritized so that (1) at least one “small population” proposal will be funded and (2) each of the six priority categories listed on page 1 of this RFP will be funded. These two funding priorities will be implemented as follows:

1. Highest Scoring “Small County Population” Proposal: The highest scoring proposal that meets the minimum scoring threshold submitted by an applicant entity located in a county with a population of less than 200,001 will be funded even if it scores

lower than other proposals. Population shall be determined by using the 2020 population estimates published by the California Department of Finance (see Appendix D 2020 County Population Index). For an entity with more than one physical location, the address used on the applicant form shall be used to determine in which county the applicant is located.

2. Highest Scoring Native American Tribe Proposal: The highest scoring proposal that meets the minimum scoring threshold submitted by a California tribal applicant or applicant entity partnering with a tribe located in California will be funded.

3. Six Program Purpose Areas: Applicants will identify one or more Program Purpose Areas (PPAs) that their proposal will address on the Applicant Information Form. It is the intent of this grant to fund at least one proposal in each of the six PPAs. This means a proposal that funds a particular PPA may be funded even if the proposal scores lower than other proposals that fund different priority areas.

Match Requirement

The Title II Grant Program Grant does not require a match.

NOTES:

E. PROMISING, DATA-DRIVEN, AND INNOVATIVE APPROACHES

❖ **ESC DECISION POINTS.** Discuss, consider, and make decisions on the following:

Does the ESC recommend any changes to the approach in the last RFP?

Discussion:

Recommendation:

Whenever possible, BSCC encourages grantees to employ the core principles of evidence-based practice (EBP), which places an emphasis on achieving measurable outcomes, and making sure the services provided and the resources utilized are effective.

While grantees are encouraged to develop projects that incorporate the principles of evidence-based practice, BSCC also recognizes that services must be tailored to fit the needs of the communities they serve. Innovation and creativity are permitted but should be founded upon existing data and research on best practices in this field.

Applicants seeking funding through this grant process are required to demonstrate that they will adhere to the basic principles of evidence-based practice (e.g., using data and research to drive decision-making) in the development, implementation, and evaluation of their overall projects.

The concept of evidence-based practice was developed outside of criminal justice and is commonly used in other applied fields such as medicine, nursing, and social work. In criminal justice, this term marks a significant shift by emphasizing measurable outcomes and ensuring that services and resources are effective in achieving the desired outcomes.

The BSCC is committed to supporting this focus on better outcomes for the entire criminal justice system and for those involved in it. For this RFP, applicants should focus on the following three basic principles:

- 1. Is there evidence or data to suggest that the intervention or strategy is likely to work, i.e., produce a desired benefit?** For example, was the intervention or strategy selected used by another jurisdiction with documented positive results? Is there published research on the intervention chosen to implement showing its effectiveness? Is the intervention or strategy being used by another jurisdiction with a similar problem and similar target population?
- 2. Once an intervention or strategy is selected, will you be able to demonstrate that it is being carried out as intended?** For example, does this intervention or strategy provide for a way to monitor quality control or continuous quality improvement? If this intervention or strategy was implemented in another jurisdiction, are there procedures in place to ensure that the model is followed closely?

- 3. Is there a plan to collect evidence or data that will allow for an evaluation of whether the intervention or strategy worked?** For example, will the intervention or strategy selected allow for the collection of data or other evidence so that outcomes can be measured at the conclusion of the project? Are there processes in place to identify, collect and analyze that data/evidence?

Applicants are encouraged to develop an overall project that incorporates these principles. Plans to measure the effectiveness of a project should include the use of both qualitative and quantitative research. While quantitative research is based on numbers and mathematical calculations, qualitative research is based on written or spoken narratives. The purpose of quantitative research is to explain, predict and/or control events through focused collection of numerical data, while the purpose of qualitative research is to explain and gain insight and understanding of events through intensive collection of narrative data.

Applicants can find information on evidence-based treatment practices in the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration's (SAMHSA) Guide to Evidence-Based Practices available at www.samhsa.gov/ebwebguide as well as in Appendix N of this RFP.

NOTES:

F. RACIAL AND ETHNIC DISPARITY (R.E.D.)

❖ **ESC DECISION POINTS.** Discuss, consider and make decisions on the following:

Should there be a separate narrative section for addressing R.E.D. or should the applicant address R.E.D. activities in the overall program proposal narrative?

Discussion:

California's youth of color are disproportionately represented as they progress through the juvenile justice system and this overrepresentation becomes amplified at each successive decision point - from contact through commitment. The SACJJDP has determined that each applicant for Title II funding should address R.E.D.

Goal:

Eliminate racial inequalities and inequities across all points of contact.

Objectives:

- Support agencies and organizations that have a data driven, long-term R.E.D. initiative;
- Provide training on R.E.D. philosophy and principles for those that work with at-risk and justice involved youth; and
- Foster partnerships between community-based organizations (CBOs) and other youth-serving agencies and law enforcement, with a specific focus on helping law enforcement entities interact with youth in ways that are sensitive to their socio-cultural context.

Recommendation:

Research¹ shows that youth and adults of color are significantly overrepresented in the criminal justice system in California. BSCC supports efforts to reduce racial and ethnic disparities and encourages others to do the same. The BSCC has undertaken a number of activities to ensure that California addresses this concern including trainings.

The applicant must consider how reducing racial and ethnic disparity (R.E.D.) information may influence grant activities in the development of the Title II Grant Program proposal.

NOTES:

¹ There are multiple studies confirming the disparities in the criminal and juvenile justice systems. BSCC has done extensive work with The W. Haywood Burns Institute (<http://www.burnsinstitute.org/>) on this issue as well as working with the National Council on Crime and Delinquency (NCCD) and the Center for Juvenile Justice Reform, Georgetown University

(<http://cjjr.georgetown.edu/certprogs/racialdisparities/racialdisparities.html>)

Created Equal: Racial and Ethnic Disparities in the US Criminal Justice System (NCCD: Hartney/Vuong March 2009)

G. DATA COLLECTION AND EVALUATION

❖ **ESC DECISION POINTS.** Discuss, consider and make decisions on the following:

How much funding should applicants be required to dedicate to Data Collection and Evaluation efforts?

Discussion:

The BSCC is to administer the grant programs and report on program outcomes. To ensure that projects funded by the BSCC provide required information and data, progress reports will be developed by which grantees will report outcomes on a quarterly basis throughout the grant period. The OJJDP determines the data elements to be collected based on the program purpose area. A final evaluation report would typically be due within three (2) to six (6) months after the grant has concluded in order to include all reporting data quarters.

As a matter of standard BSCC practice, all grantees are required to submit a Local Evaluation Plan within three months of being awarded. The purpose of a Local Evaluation Plan is to ensure programs funded by the BSCC can be evaluated.

All grantees are also required to submit a Final Local Evaluation Report at the conclusion of the grant. The purpose of the Final Local Evaluation Report is to determine whether the overall program (including each project component) was effective in meeting the goals laid out in the Local Evaluation Plan.

ESCs typically allocate 5% - 20% for evaluation costs. As indicated previously, this can be done as a straight-percentage (10% across the term of the contract) or a graduated percentage (e.g., 5% Year 1; 7% Year 2; 10% Year 3; etc.).

The ESC may want to consider encouraging or requiring applicants to work with a local university or college on its evaluation efforts (versus being allowed to do the work in-house).

Recommendation:

Evaluation planning, oversight, and reporting activities may be funded by up to 5% of the total Title II Grant Program award and can be included within the applicant's proposed budget.

NOTES:

H. ADMINISTRATIVE

❖ **ESC DECISION POINTS.** Discuss, consider and make decisions on the following:

Should there be page limits set for the proposals submitted? If yes, what should the limits be?

- **Typically range between 15-20 pages and does not include budget table and budget narrative. Keep in mind that you'll need to read and score each proposal.**

Discussion:

This is a competitive grant program and proposals will be scored based on factors this ESC will determine (more on that later). The technical review process is where BSCC staff review submitted materials by the applicants to determine whether they meet the non-negotiable requirements. For example, if a proposal is submitted by an ineligible applicant. To avoid having otherwise worthy proposals eliminated from consideration due to relatively minor and easily corrected errors or omissions, BSCC provides applicants an opportunity to respond to minor deficiencies identified during this review process and to make non-substantive changes that bring the proposal into technical compliance.

The BSCC routinely reviews the following items as a part of the technical review process:

- Proposal meets all format requirements (font, spacing and page limitations).
- Proposed budget meets all requirements.
- Proposal contains all required signatures.

Typically, applicants are offered a limited time (2-3 days) to correct errors or include missing elements related to the technical review as long as it does not substantially change the proposal.

Recommendation:

Instructions: The Proposal Narrative section must be submitted in Arial 12-point font with one-inch margins on all four sides. The narrative must be 1.5-line spaced and cannot exceed **15 numbered pages** in length. For the Proposal Narrative, address each of the five (5) sections below. Each section should be titled according to its section header as provided (e.g., Project Need, Project Description and Work Plan, Project Collaboration, Evidence-based Practices and Strategies, and Project Evaluation). Within each section, address the bulleted items in a cohesive, comprehensive narrative format. Do not include website links.

The 15-page limitation for this section does not include the mandatory Cover Sheet, Proposal Checklist, Applicant Information Form, Project Abstract, Budget Table, Budget Narrative, or other required attachments.

It is up to the applicant to determine how to best use the total 15-page limit in addressing each section; however, as a guide, the percent of total point value for each section is listed within each header.

NOTES:

❖ ESC DECISION POINTS. Discuss, consider and make decisions on the following:

Should the ESC allow for any additional pages for attachments (e.g., resources, graphs, charts, letters of support, etc.). If so, how many pages beyond the narrative sections limit?

Recommendation:

1. Cover Sheet
2. Title II Proposal Checklist
3. Applicant Information Form
4. Proposal Abstract (1 page)
5. Proposal Narrative (15 pages or less)
6. Budget Table Template with Narrative
7. Title II Implementation Workplan Template
8. Certification of Compliance with BSCC Policies (Debarment, Fraud, etc.)
9. Signed Criteria for NGO's
10. Letter(s) of support from partnering organizations

NOTES:

I. RATING CRITERIA AND FACTORS

❖ **ESC DECISION POINTS. Discuss, consider, and make decisions on the following:**

This section will be led by BSCC research staff.

1. What rating criteria should the members of the ESC use in evaluating the merit of proposals and developing funding recommendations for consideration by the BSCC Board?
 2. How should the criteria be defined and what weight should be assigned to each rating factor?
 3. Should the ESC determine any “priority or preference” given to those grant applications that include a specific priority identified by the ESC?
-