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## Questions and Contact Information

All questions and correspondence regarding this Tier 2 Grant Request for Applications (RFA) should be submitted by email through the Tobacco-Use Prevention Education (TUPE) RFA Helpdesk at tupe@cde.ca.gov (please indicate “Tier 2 Grant RFA Question” in the email subject line). All questions will be reviewed by the TUPE Office. You may contact the TUPE Office by phone at 916-323-1540, however, the information contained in this RFA and RFA Guidance Webinar should be your primary resource documents.

**All completed RFAs should be uploaded to the TUPE Grant Electronic Management System (TUPE GEMS) on the TUPE GEMS website at:** **[https://tupegems.ucsd.edu](https://tupegems.ucsd.edu/%22%20%5Co%20%22TUPE%20Grant%20Electronic%20Management%20System%20website). Hard copy submissions to the California Department of Education (CDE) will not be accepted in lieu of the required upload of applications.**

**Note:** The RFA process is competitive and is reviewed and scored by readers using a scoring rubric. Applicants are strongly encouraged to read the entire Tier 2 Grant RFA, view the guidance webinar, and consider all elements for eligibility, program and narrative requirements, and disqualifications prior to submitting a complete application.

## Application Highlights for the Tier 2 Grant

* The TUPE Tier 2 Grant is available for a three-year period from July 1, 2020, to June 30, 2023. Approximately $20 million from both Proposition 56 and Proposition 99 tax revenues have been allocated to the California Department of Education (CDE) to fund Year 1 of the Tier 2 Grant Program.
* The grant award period is for three years; however if funded, Grant Award Notifications (AO-400s) will be allocated annually and updated annual budgets will be required. Only one funding source will be assigned (either Proposition 56 or Proposition 99) to reduce administrative costs and expenditure tracking.
* School districts, direct-funded charter schools, and county offices of education (COEs) serving grades six through twelve (6–12) in California are eligible to apply if they meet the eligibility requirements.
* Applications must be submitted through the TUPE GEMS, which is managed by the University of California, San Diego.
* Applicants may submit up to two applications per lead agency: one for urban sites and one for rural sites.
* A geographic funding distribution section has been added where Northern, Central, and Southern California, and urban and rural sites will compete for funding in similar geographic categories.
* A minimum of 25 percent of the overall funding requested must be allocated to student services.
* The TUPE Office will post a pre-recorded guidance webinar on

**February 18, 2020.** The purpose of the webinar is to provide guidance to assist applicants with program requirements for the Tier 2 Grant Application. The webinar may be viewed at any time after posting and does not require pre-registration.

* The TUPE Office will provide an RFA Helpdesk to assist applicants with RFA-related questions. The RFA Helpdesk will be available during the open application period from **February 4, 2020, to March 17, 2020.**
* All required application materials and webinar will be available on the CDE TUPE Tier 2 Grant RFA web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/fo/r8/tier2rfa20.asp> and [https://tupegems.ucsd.edu](https://tupegems.ucsd.edu/).
*
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### Critical Dates for the Application Process

The following chart identifies the anticipated critical dates for the application process. **These dates may be extended by the CDE at its discretion.** Any changes will be posted on the CDE TUPE Tier 2 Grant RFA web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/fo/r8/tier2rfa20.asp>.

| **Dates** | **Critical Events** |
| --- | --- |
| **February 4, 2020** | RFA and supporting documents are posted on the CDE TUPE Funding web page at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ls/he/at/tupefunding.asp>. |
| **February 4–March 17, 2020** | Tier 2 Grant RFA Helpdesk is available at tupe@cde.ca.gov. |
| **February 14, 2020** | **Intent to Submit an Application (ITS) is due to the CDE through the grant online management system.** Failure to submit this form in the (TUPE GEMS) will result in disqualification of the application from moving forward to the reading and scoring process. |
| **February 18, 2020** | Tier 2 Grant RFA Guidance Webinar (pre-recorded) posted on the CDE TUPE Tier 2 Grant RFA web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/fo/r8/tier2rfa20.asp>. |
| **March 18, 2020** | **Submission deadline for complete applications** through the grant online management system to the TUPE GEMS.  |
| **April 2020** | Applicants are notified if they have been disqualified based on CDE screening.Appeals are due to the CDE 10 days after notification of disqualification.Review and scoring of eligible applications through the TUPE GEMS. |
| **April 2020** | Intent to Award (ITA) is posted on the CDE TUPE Funding web page at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ls/he/at/tupefunding.asp>. **Note:** The ITA is **not** the final funding list.Appeals are due to the CDE 10 days after ITA notification. |
| **May 2020** | Final Funding List is posted on the CDE TUPE Funding web page at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ls/he/at/tupefunding.asp>.  |
| **May–June 2020** | AO-400s sent to grantees. |
| **July 1, 2020** | Grant period begins. |

###

### Description and Purpose of the Program

#### Background

In 1988, California voters approved Proposition 99, the Tobacco Tax and Health Protection Act, which required the CDE to establish a TUPE Program that provided students in grades 6–12 with the knowledge and skills directed at the prevention of tobacco-use and tobacco-related diseases.

The Tobacco Education and Research Oversight Committee (TEROC) was also created to advise state agencies, including the CDE, with respect to policy development, integration, and evaluation of funded tobacco education programs, including the TUPE Program. In addition, the TEROC is instrumental with the development of a Master Plan for future implementation of tobacco education programs. The TEROC members represent the spectrum of areas of the tobacco control field, including public health, medicine, higher education, research, community advocates, voluntary health organizations, youth-serving organizations, and kindergarten through twelfth grade education.

In 2016, California voters approved Proposition 56, which aims to further prevent and reduce the use of tobacco and nicotine products by young people in accordance with California *Health and Safety Code* *(HSC)* Section 104420, and accelerate and monitor the rate of decline in tobacco-related disparities for the purpose of eliminating tobacco-related disparities (California *Revenue and Taxation Code* Section 30130.55[b][2] *Healthcare, Research and Prevention Tobacco Tax Act of 2016*, *Distribution of Revenue*). The authorizing legislation can be found on the California Legislative Information website at <https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/>.

Several grant programs were developed as a result of the passage of Proposition 99 and Proposition 56. The resultant Tier 1 Grant, Tier 2 Grant, and Youth Engagement to Address Tobacco-Related Health Disparities Grant RFAs provided funding opportunities for school districts, direct-funded charter schools, COEs, and consortia. These grants funded the utilization of comprehensive, evidence-informed tobacco-use prevention, youth development, intervention, and reinforcement activities for tobacco-free school environments, and cessation programs as strategies against smoking and secondhand smoke exposure, which are the leading causes of preventable death in this country.

The Legislature requires that the funds allocated under this Tier 2 Grant RFA must be used to develop school-based anti-tobacco education programs and tobacco-use intervention and cessation activities in order to reduce the number of students in California who begin to use tobacco, continue to use tobacco, or both (*HSC* 104420[k][1]).

#### Purpose

The goal of the TUPE Program is to prevent and/or reduce student tobacco-use and nicotine addiction by funding local educational agency (LEA) programs to provide education for young people to make healthful decisions through tobacco-specific, evidence-informed educational instruction and activities that build knowledge, social skills, and youth development assets. Collaboration between the CDE and community-based tobacco control programs funded through the California Department of Public Health (CDPH), California Tobacco Control Program, University of California, Office of the President, Tobacco-Related Disease Research Program, and California Office of the Attorney General, is an integral part of this process. As such, the school, parents/guardians, and the larger community should be involved in the collaborative efforts of the program so that students are aware of a cohesive effort and concern for their health, and consequently, their ability to succeed in school and live a healthy life that is tobacco and nicotine free.

School connectedness is the belief held by students that the adults and peers in their school care about their learning and about them as individuals. Students who feel connected to school are more likely to have a number of positive health and academic outcomes, and school connectedness represents an important factor in both health and learning (Babey, S., Wolstein, J., Becker, T., and Scheitler, A.J. *Health Policy Brief: School Discipline Practices Associated with Adolescent School Connectedness and Engagement*, University of California, Los Angeles Center for Health Policy Research, September 2019). For example, data from that study has shown that students who feel connected to school are more likely to attend school regularly, stay in school longer, have higher grades and test scores, and are less likely to use tobacco and drink alcohol. Conversely, students with low levels of school connectedness have higher rates of electronic cigarette (e-cigarette) use than their more connected peers.

The role of tobacco-use education and prevention and school engagement is reflected in the contrast between current smoking students and their non-smoking peers in three areas: (1) school connectedness, (2) academic performance, and (3) truancy. According to 2015–17 California Healthy Kids Survey (CHKS) data, current smoking students across grades seven, nine, and eleven, had a level of school connectedness that is 20 percent lower than non-smoking students at the same grade levels. The survey results also showed that current smoking students had much lower academic performance than their non-smoking peers. An average of 25.6 percent fewer current smokers had mostly A grades and B grades than their non-smoking peers. The survey also revealed that current smokers had a 34 percent higher level of truancy than non-smokers. The data suggests that implementation of evidence-informed health promotion programs by schools, coupled with strategies to promote school connectedness, can have the greatest impact on the health and education outcomes of their students.

Four essential factors can help strengthen school connectedness for students: adult support, belonging to a positive peer group, commitment to education, and a positive school environment. For tobacco prevention, that includes evidence-informed curricula and activities that provide opportunities to improve interpersonal and decision-making skills. Examples of how school connectedness lends itself to youth engagement include working effectively with others, encouraging students to be involved in service learning, peer-to-peer education, and involvement with creative projects. Youth engagement provides students with the opportunity to build resources, share ideas, and become involved in the decision making alongside adult partners about issues that are important to them.

Advancing students’ health and academic outcomes by improving school connectedness is a collaborative effort that involves the school community as well as parent, family, or community involvement. Parents and families can play an important role in providing social and environmental support to prevent and intervene in the use of tobacco. The applicant should be encouraged to capitalize on this influence by involving parents and families in the development of the application Program Plan, in soliciting community support for the program, and in reinforcing tobacco-free educational messages at home. Homework assignments involving parents and families increase the likelihood that smoking is discussed at home, and may motivate adult smokers in the family to quit or reduce their own tobacco-use. The applicant should also encourage community support and plan training sessions for parents and families.

While one cannot control all components and influences on local school campuses, this Tier 2 Grant RFA seeks applications which offer a youth engagement approach in addressing youth tobacco education to maximize student, staff, peer, and community involvement and accelerate and monitor the rate of decline in tobacco-related disparities.

Youth tobacco education and prevention is important because initiation of tobacco-use, including vaping and e-cigarettes, generally starts in one’s youth. More alarmingly, the use of electronic smoking devices among California high school students increased significantly between 2015 and 2018, from 8.6 percent to 10.9 percent (*California Tobacco Facts and Figures 2018*, CDPH). Electronic smoking devices, often called e-cigarettes or vape pens, heat and aerosolize a liquid that contains a variety of ingredients, including flavorings and varying levels of nicotine. The “e-liquid” in e-cigarettes is largely available in candy and fruit flavors such as cotton candy, gummy bear, watermelon, and grape, flavors that are meant to attract youth. Even “Hello Kitty” e-cigarettes are sold. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), use of electronic smoking devices has increased substantially in recent years, particularly among youth. Based on the 2015–17 CHKS, an estimated 8.1 percent of seventh graders, 23.2 percent of ninth graders, and 31.7 percent of eleventh graders in California used e-cigarettes. Under California state law, a tobacco product is any product containing, made from, or derived from tobacco or nicotine, and any electronic vaping device or component, part, or accessory. The CDC warns that nicotine is highly addictive and can harm adolescent brain development, which continues into the early to mid-20s. In 2016, an estimated 7.9 percent of California high school-age students co-used cannabis and tobacco products (this includes vaping). This funding opportunity seeks to address these startling developments.

#### Tobacco-Use Prevention Education Social-Ecological Model

TUPE uses a five-level social-ecological model to assess how environmental and interpersonal factors can encourage or deter tobacco-use and vaping among youth. Each level of the model identifies a point of influence and a potential opportunity for intervention. For example, the “Individual” level examines how factors such as attitudes and knowledge may increase or decrease the likelihood of tobacco-use and vaping. The “Interpersonal” level examines the role of peers, family, partners, and mentors. The “School” and “Community” levels explore how behavior is impacted by teachers and the social and physical characteristics of institutions, environmental settings, media, and advertising. The “Policy” level looks at the broader implications of laws, rules, and enforcement measures. The model provides a useful framework to assist TUPE programs and community partners in determining how to focus strategies and resources.

#### Funding

The Tier 2 Grant Program provides funding for three years, beginning July 1, 2020, through June 30, 2023. Approximately $20 million from both Proposition 56 and Proposition 99 tax revenues has been allocated to fund Year 1 of the Tier 2 Grant Program. The level of funding appropriated by the Legislature, the number of qualified applications, and the total amount requested by qualified applicants will determine the number of grants awarded.

The CDE reserves the right to renew or extend selected grants in the best interest of the statewide tobacco prevention effort. Although it is anticipated that funding for the TUPE Tier 2 Grant Program will be available for future years, this may change as a result of the legislative process or oversight committee recommendations by the TEROC.

Funding has previously been offered under other TUPE Program RFAs for programs directed at both the general student population and priority subgroups. This funding should supplement, not supplant, any existing TUPE funding. All funding received pursuant to this Tier 2 Grant RFA must be accounted for independently and separately from all other TUPE grant funds.

The use of TUPE funds for any purpose other than the reduction or elimination of tobacco-use for students is not authorized. Funded programs may address marijuana use as it relates to co-use of this drug and tobacco, or as it relates to the use of electronic smoking devices, which are defined as tobacco products under California law. When staff positions are multi-funded, there should be personnel activity reports that verify the duties performed and the proportion of time spent for those duties as appropriate to the corresponding grant funding sources used. Products or services that relate to tobacco-use prevention issues may be supported by TUPE funds to the percentage that the product or service effectively prevents tobacco-use behaviors.

Funding for this grant is based on the average daily attendance (ADA) for the grade levels to be served by the program, as reported for the second period of the 2018–19 school year. The total maximum allowable funding is $54 per student ADA for the full three-year term of the grant (i.e., $18 per student ADA for each year of the grant). The $2 million cap from the prior Tier 2 RFA has been removed.

### Eligibility Requirements

Applicants must meet all the eligibility requirements set forth below. The programs offered by applicants must meet the requirements set forth in this Tier 2 Grant RFA. Thus, applicants must read and understand this entire Tier 2 Grant RFA as well as view the guidance webinar and consider all eligibility and program requirements prior to submitting an application. Any questions regarding this Tier 2 Grant RFA should be submitted by email through the TUPE RFA Helpdesk at tupe@cde.ca.gov.

#### Who May Apply?

Public school districts, direct-funded charter schools, COEs, or consortia that serve students in grades 6–12 within the State of California are eligible to apply. The governing district must apply on behalf of a school or school sites within its jurisdiction. Individual schools, community agencies, private schools, and locally-funded charter schools are not eligible to apply for these funds. Projects targeting out-of-school students cannot be funded under this application.

Currently-funded TUPE grantees and new applicants may apply. Any district or direct-funded charter school that is a member of a Tier 1 consortium is eligible to apply separately or as a group. However, any current Tier 1 grantees awarded a Tier 2 Grant will be required to terminate the current Tier 1 Grant as a stipulation of receiving Tier 2 Grant funds. Current Tier 1 grantees that are unsuccessful applicants for Tier 2 funding will retain the Tier 1 Grant award and continue to receive Tier 1 funding.

#### Absence of Tobacco Industry Funding or Support

Applicants are ineligible for any TUPE grant funding if they have received directly or indirectly, any funding, educational materials, or services from the tobacco, vaping, or marijuana industries even if for the purpose of implementing tobacco-use prevention, youth development, intervention, or cessation programs. In addition, TUPE grantees are prohibited from accepting such materials and services for the duration of the grant. Acceptance of such items will result in termination of the grant and the return of all advanced grant funds and may disqualify LEAs from future TUPE funding opportunities.

A signature by the Superintendent or Designee on the Grant Application Cover Sheet constitutes an assurance that the COEs, districts, or direct-funded charter schools identified in the Tier 2 Grant application will not accept materials, services, or funding from the tobacco, vaping, or marijuana industries.

#### Other Eligibility Requirements

The application submitted must (1) show that the applicant’s program meets the Tier 2 Grant TUPE Program Requirements, (2) comply with the TUPE GEMS online Application Submission and Narrative Requirements, (3) meet all other conditions, requirements, and deadlines, and (4) provide signatures as set forth in this RFA.

### Overview of the Application Process

#### Application Types

Applicants may submit no more than two complete applications. If submitting two applications, one application must contain all of the urban sites participating in the program, and the second application must contain all of the rural sites participating in the program.

In the case where applicants prefer to submit just one application (e.g., a small district), if the percentage for the dominant school type is 75 percent and above, the applicant must pick the grant type that matches the dominant school type (i.e., either urban or rural). If the percentage is between 50 percent and 74 percent, an applicant can pick either grant type (urban or rural) in which to submit their applications **but must identify the geographic funding category in which they are competing on the Grant Application Cover Sheet in the TUPE GEMS.**

#### Individual Local Educational Agency Applications

The individual LEA application requires: (1) the maintenance and enforcement of the LEA’s Tobacco-Free School Policy, (2) the implementation of an evidence-informed program that has been proven effective to prevent tobacco-use for the general student population, (3) the implementation of a tobacco-focused youth development strategy or strategies, (4) an intervention plan for those most at-risk to initiate tobacco-use, and (5) either the provision of cessation activities or a plan to refer current tobacco-users to cessation classes provided by the community or through the California Smokers’ Helpline and Vape Line.

Each school represented in the application is required to implement a TUPE curriculum for the general student population in grades 6–12. The grade levels selected for implementation need not be all inclusive. Implementation is based on the grade levels for which the evidence-informed curriculum is designed. If the selected program is designed to be implemented in two grade levels in grades six through eight, then the implementation of the program can occur in grades six and seven, or grades seven and eight as needed to meet implementation guidelines.

Applicants are required to implement a youth development strategy or strategies, and are strongly encouraged to solicit both the general student population and priority subgroups to participate. Youth development activities must have a direct relationship to tobacco-use prevention. Youth development strategies can address the needs of the general population and/or priority subgroup identified as most at-risk for beginning tobacco-use at any of grades 6–12.

Applicants should identify the priority subgroup(s) that are most at-risk for beginning tobacco-use and provide intervention strategies to meet the needs of those students. The applicant is strongly encouraged to solicit both the general student population and priority subgroups to participate in intervention strategies. Identification of these priority subgroups should be a component of the agency’s Needs Assessment and should address populations with disproportionately high rates of tobacco use. Examples of priority subgroups include, but are not limited to, African Americans, American Indians and Alaska Natives, Asians, Hispanics/Latinos, Native Hawaiians/Pacific Islanders, foster youth, students experiencing homelessness, pregnant minors or minor parents, not straight—gay, lesbian, bisexual, or transgender, low socio-economic status (Free and Reduced-Price Meals eligible), students in non-traditional schools (including, but not limited to, continuation and community day schools), and other subgroups identified by the LEA as being at greater risk and supported by existing data.

Applicants must identify any populations currently using tobacco or vaping, and either provide current users with voluntary cessation services or describe a plan to refer them to cessation classes provided by the community or through the California Smokers’ Helpline and Vape Line. Applicants may propose other activities to supplement the required prevention program activities and strategies. Supplemental activities must have a direct relationship to tobacco-use prevention and must be justified in the Application Narrative.

#### Consortia Applications

Public school districts, direct-funded charter schools, and COEs may collaborate to form a consortia for the purposes of this grant application. A single school district, direct-funded charter school, or COE must be designated on the Tier 2 Grant Application Cover Sheet as the applicant agency and lead agency with fiscal and reporting responsibility for the consortia. The role of the consortia lead must be clearly described in the Application Narrative and delineated in the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the consortia lead and consortia member agencies.

A consortia must apply the criteria required of individual LEA applications to each member of the consortium and address the required items for each consortium member. For example, in a consortia consisting of two districts serving grades

6–12, both LEAs must provide an evidence-informed prevention program, youth development strategies, intervention, and cessation/referral activities to both the general student population and their priority subgroups in both jurisdictions. The application cannot propose to provide curriculum, youth development, intervention, and cessation activities at one district and not the other. The strategies taken for each district may be different, as not every district has the same needs.

#### Geographic Funding Distribution

Per *HSC* Section 104420(k)(2)(D)(4), the CDE must consider the need to balance rural, suburban, and urban projects when allocating grant awards. As such, applicants must identify the category in which their applications will be competing in one of the following six geographic funding categories (identified on the Grant Application Cover Sheet in the TUPE GEMS):

* Northern-Urban
* Northern-Rural
* Central-Urban
* Central-Rural
* Southern-Urban
* Southern-Rural

Northern California consists of California County Superintendents Educational Services Association (CCSESA) regions 1 through 4, Central California consists of CCSESA regions 5 through 8, and Southern California consists of CCSESA regions 9 through 11. Applicants can determine their service region on the CCSESSA map at <https://ccsesa.org/regions/>.

Applicants can determine their Rural and Urban Classifications by visiting the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) Search for Public Schools online tool at <https://nces.ed.gov/ccd/schoolsearch/> and entering the search criteria as directed. Sites in the NCES database are identified in one of the following classifications:

| **Urban Classification** | **Rural Classification** |
| --- | --- |
| 11—City, Large | 31—Town, Fringe |
| 12—City, Midsize | 32—Town, Distant |
| 13—City, Small | 33—Town, Remote |
| 21—Suburb, Large | 41—Rural, Fringe |
| 22—Suburb, Midsize | 42—Rural, Distant |
| 23—Suburb, Small | 43—Rural, Remote |

### Tobacco-Use Prevention Education Program Guidance

The Tier 2 Grant Application should be designed as a three-year sustainable program that focuses on planning in Year 1, implementation in Year 2, and evaluation and improvement in Year 3. Those applicants that have previously used the model proposed in the application in their current TUPE programs, and are well into the implementation and evaluation stage, may want to consider adding a continuous quality improvement process as part of their Program Plan. A clear articulation and demonstration of good planning and direct services for students, school staff, and parents is now required.

The following section provides TUPE Program requirements as well as general program guidance for applicants applying for this grant funding.

#### Program Plan

The LEA is required to develop an initial TUPE Program Plan for the general student population as well as priority subgroups. The purpose of the Program Plan is to identify activities and strategies that address the unmet needs of all students identified by the applicant. Considerations include what tobacco-use prevention efforts will be implemented at the participating school site(s) and how other community-based prevention resources will be used to help meet the general student population and priority subgroup needs at school sites. The student-centered approach should include an overall Needs Assessment conducted by a collaborative group.

#### Collaborative Process

Each applicant is required to develop a collaborative process, which includes establishment of a collaborative oversight group. This group should include, but is not limited to, the TUPE County Coordinator, district-level coordinator, youth engagement or community engagement coordinators from local public health and tobacco control agencies, coalitions, the community at large, parents and family members, school resource officers, counselors or other school staff, and students. Additional members may also come from other supporting agencies. The collaborative oversight group should conduct ongoing and regular meetings to ensure the development, implementation, evaluation, and improvement of Program Plan goals and objectives. Students should be involved in the application’s development and the collaborative oversight group must ensure the active participation of students and others throughout the grant term. The collaborative group should consider elements such as curriculum selection, identification of an intervention and cessation plan, and effective service assessments when developing their overall Program Plan.

#### Needs Assessment

A comprehensive Needs Assessment is required to identify unmet program needs. It should be conducted by the collaborative oversight group via collection and analysis of various qualitative and quantitative data, including CHKS data and other local data related to student tobacco use, funding, and/or resources. As a result of this Needs Assessment, applicants are expected to identify needs by program areas, including Student Services, Staff Professional Development, Family and Community Engagement, Interagency Partnerships, Tobacco-free Policy Development and Implementation, Project Monitoring and Evaluation, and LEA Technical Assistance if applicable. Adequate efforts should also be devoted to identifying needs for priority subgroups.

#### Evidence-Informed Curriculum Program

Each school identified in the application is required to implement an approved, evidence-informed curriculum program. An evidence-informed curriculum consists of practices and strategies that have been vetted through rigorous research and has evidence of effectiveness to prevent tobacco use for the specific student subgroup(s) selected in grades 6–12.

Implementation is based on the grade levels for which the evidence-informed curriculum is designed. If the selected program is designed to be implemented in two grade levels in grades six through eight, the expectation is that the implementation of the program will occur in grades six and seven or grades seven and eight as needed to meet implementation guidelines.

#### Implementation of a Youth Development Strategy

Applicants are required to implement a tobacco-free focused youth development strategy. Tobacco-free focused youth development strategies are defined as intentional, prosocial approaches that engage youth within their communities, schools, organizations, peer groups, and families in a manner that is productive and constructive; recognizes, utilizes, and enhances young people’s strengths; and promotes positive outcomes for young people by providing opportunities, fostering positive relationships, and furnishing the support needed to build on their leadership strengths. Youth development activities must directly support tobacco-use prevention. Youth development strategies can be used to address the needs of the specific subgroup(s) identified for tobacco use at any of grades 6–12.

#### Intervention Strategies

Applicants are required to identify the students that are most likely to begin tobacco use and provide intervention strategies to meet the needs of those students. Intervention strategies are defined as a combination of program elements or strategies designed to produce behavior changes or improve health status among individuals or an entire group. Interventions may include educational programs, new or stronger policies, improvements in the environment, or health promotion campaigns.

**Note:** The CDE supports an Alternative to Suspension Model.

The applicant is also strongly encouraged to intentionally solicit priority subgroup youth to participate in intervention strategies. Identification of these subgroups should be a component of the district’s Needs Assessment and should address subgroups with disproportionately high rates of tobacco use.

#### Cessation Activities or Referral Plan

Applicants are required to identify the students currently using tobacco and either provide current tobacco-users with voluntary cessation services or describe a plan to refer them to cessation classes provided by the community. Applicants should address both traditional tobacco products and e-cigarettes when addressing this requirement, including identifying resources that focus specifically on cigarette use. Applicants may propose other activities to address the required prevention program activities and strategies.

#### Tobacco-Free Policy Development

In accordance with *HSC* Section 104420(n)(2), all COEs, school districts, and charter schools that receive TUPE funding are required to adopt and enforce a tobacco-free school policy no later than July 1 of each fiscal year (FY). The policy shall prohibit the use of products containing tobacco and nicotine including, but not limited to, smokeless tobacco, snuff, chew, clove cigarettes, and e-cigarettes that can deliver nicotine and non-nicotine vaporized solutions, at any time, in COE, charter school, or school district-owned or leased buildings, on school or district property, and in school or district vehicles. However, this section does not prohibit the use or possession of prescription products, nicotine patches, or nicotine gum. In addition to the harmful effects of nicotine, flavorings, and other chemical additives, e-cigarettes have introduced another mechanism for students to consume marijuana. Consequently, tobacco-free school policies have the additional benefit of addressing student use of marijuana through vaping.

Information about the policy and enforcement procedures shall be communicated clearly to school personnel, parents, pupils, and the larger community. Signs stating “Tobacco-use is prohibited” shall be prominently displayed at all entrances to school property as provided in *HSC* Section 104559. Signs may also state “the use of tobacco, e-cigarettes, and marijuana is prohibited,” as long as the word “tobacco” is included in the sign. Information about smoking cessation support programs shall be made available and encouraged for pupils and staff. Any school district, charter school, or COE that does not have a tobacco-free district policy implemented by July 1, shall not be eligible to apply for funds from the Cigarette and Tobacco Products Surtax Fund for that FY.

#### California Healthy Kids Survey Requirements

All successful grantees (districts and schools) are required to conduct the district-level CHKS Core Module with the subgroup population of students in grades six, seven, nine, and eleven. Survey results, to the extent possible, must be reported by school site and student ethnicity. The survey is to be administered within the first year of funding and at least every other year thereafter as long as funding is received. For any participating school, if the total number of students for a grade level is less than 25, the grantee is required to establish a local alternative to fulfill their student tobacco-use survey requirements.

In the event that grade six students participate in the CHKS, the use of the secondary module is required rather than the elementary module, to ensure that sufficient data is captured regarding tobacco/vaping use. The current elementary module does not contain sufficient data for the purpose of TUPE program development.

If an LEA has conducted the CHKS in the school year prior to the first year of a TUPE grant and is planning to conduct the CHKS in the second school year of the grant, the LEA may continue conducting the survey every other year and does not need to conduct it within the first year of the grant. A grantee is required to collect and maintain the complete record of the prior year school-level CHKS administration and make it available upon request from the CDE. Depending on local funding availability, additional grade levels (grades eight and ten), California School Staff Survey and California School Parent Survey administrations are also allowable.

Applicants are encouraged to refer to an individual LEA’s adopted policies and administrative regulations regarding conducting student surveys and receiving parental permission. For additional information regarding the administration of the CHKS, visit the WestEd California School Climate, Health, and Learning Surveys web page at [https://calschls.org/reports-data/query-calschls/](https://calschls.org/).

Additionally, each Tier 2 grantee and schools are required to participate, if selected, in the California Student Tobacco Survey (CSTS) administered by the CDPH and the Evaluation of TUPE Programs in California conducted under the auspices of the University of California, Office of the President’s Tobacco-Related Disease and Research Program. The results of this statewide biennial evaluation will be made available to the CDE for the purposes of improving its ability to implement and oversee school-based tobacco-use prevention programs and to determine to what extent schools have reduced the smoking prevalence rate for high school youth. Students in grades eight, ten, and twelve, as well as school and district TUPE Program Administrators, will be among the participants of this evaluation. All schools in the LEA must participate, including those not listed in the grant application. As with the CHKS, the CSTS is conducted in accordance with board policy on parental consent and requires a beginning-of-the-year notice to parents.

### Application Forms and Narrative Components

An application submitted in the TUPE GEMS may not contain any attachments other than those required in this RFA. Additional documents uploaded with the application will not be considered by readers so as not to provide an unfair advantage over other applicants that submit only the required materials. The application in general requires applicants to complete and/or upload forms into the TUPE GEMS, and describe components of the proposed program throughout sections that require a narrative.

There are eleven sections of either forms or narrative in the online application that must be completed: (1) General Information, (2) Funding Allocation and Program Profiles, (3) Student Services, (4) Family and Community Engagement, (5) Staff Professional Development, (6) Interagency Partnerships, (7) Local Educational Agency Technical Assistance, (8) Tobacco-Free Policy Development and Implementation, (9) Project Monitoring and Evaluation, (10) Tobacco-Use Prevention Education Program Administration and Staffing, and (11) Assurances. A guidance document for each section will be provided in the TUPE GEMS.

A project abstract is required for each program area (e.g., Student Services, Family and Community Engagement, and Staff Professional Development) that describes an applicant’s general plan across the three-year grant period. For example, applicants must describe what services will be provided, and to whom and in which year; or the priority subgroups that will receive an identified curriculum and the different services planned for each of the three years. The same information is requested and should be provided for general education, prevention, intervention, and cessation services. Abstracts should also articulate past achievements (if a prior TUPE grantee) and identify lessons learned for future program development and achievement. New applicants should discuss their plans to ensure the effective use of TUPE funds over the grant period.

#### General Information (Grant Application Cover Sheet)

The Grant Application Cover Sheet consists of the applicant agency name, county-district-school codes, county name, and address of those participating in the application, the grade levels to be served, student count funding information, and grant type. Applicants must also identify which geographic funding category they are applying for on the Grant Application Cover Sheet.

An authorized signature from the applicant’s Superintendent or Designee is due at the time the application forms are uploaded into the TUPE GEMS or the application **will be disqualified.** A signature on the Grant Application Cover Sheet represents a certification that all of the forms and materials submitted through this RFA have been reviewed and approved by the Superintendent or Designee, and that all grant requirements will be completed as stated in accordance with legislation and this RFA. An electronic signature is allowed for this RFA.

A Designee may provide the authorized signature as long as a copy of a recent governing board resolution or minutes, specifically authorizing the Designee to accept and sign as a proxy for financial statements and legally binding documents, is uploaded into the TUPE GEMS with the application materials. In the absence of an authorized signature by the Designee and governing board resolution or minutes, the applicant **will be disqualified.**

All grantees are required to retain copies of signed documents for their records and for audit purposes. Please visit the CDE General Assurances and Certifications web page at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/fo/fm/ff.asp> for more information.

#### Funding Allocation and Program Profiles

The Funding Allocation and Program Profiles Section is a form within the TUPE GEMS that requires information regarding funding distribution (by member and program category), ADA profile (e.g., participating district and schools, school type, rural versus urban geographic location, and ADA by grade level), and applicant program profile (e.g., student services profile and staff professional development profile).

#### Student Services

The Student Services Section requires a description of all student services being proposed in the Program Plan. This section should encompass the services that will be provided directly to the student and should include the majority of information about the proposed TUPE Program. Development of youth engagement strategies is required for the Tier 2 Grant Program. Research has shown that by providing opportunities for students to become engaged in activities that promote a tobacco-free message not only provides a sense of school connectedness, but promotes learning and an overall sense of well-being and purpose.

#### Family and Community Engagement

The Family and Community Engagement Section requires a description of all family and community engagement services being proposed in the Program Plan. This section should encompass the services that will be provided directly to families and the community at large.

#### Staff Professional Development

The Staff Professional Development Section requires a description of all staff professional development services being proposed in the Program Plan. This section should encompass the services that will be provided directly to staff.

#### Interagency Partnerships

The Interagency Partnerships Section requires applicants to provide information about their current and proposed partners and describe the collaborative activities in which they have or will participate, including a timeline for when those activities will take place, and the expected outcomes. These partnerships are critical for providing program support and resources to schools and districts, and are an essential part of the collaborative process.

#### Local Educational Agency Technical Assistance

The LEA Technical Assistance (TA) Section should clearly identify the TA services that will be provided by the lead agency or applicant. Applicants are required to describe the specific activities being provided, the provider and recipient of the service, a timeline, measurable objectives, and the assessment tool utilized.

#### Tobacco-Free Policy Development and Implementation

The Tobacco-Free Policy Development and Implementation Section requires applicants to provide their actual or proposed certification dates and describe the actions they will implement to ensure effective communication to students, staff, parents, and the community at large. Applicants are also asked to describe the actions that will be taken to ensure effective policy implementation on school sites and at school sponsored events. Information regarding the Tobacco-Free School Policy Certification is available on the CDE Tobacco-Free School District Certification web page at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ls/he/at/tobaccofreecert.asp>.

The applicant must have been certified by the CDE as having met the tobacco-free school district criteria. This certification must be valid by July 1, 2020. Districts may still apply for funding if they are not currently certified; however, if funded, they will not receive their first payment until the certification is reviewed and approved by the CDE.

The applicant agency identified in the application must continue to meet the tobacco-free certification criteria, including enforcement of the Tobacco-Free School Policy, during the term of the grant. **This requirement extends to all schools in the LEA, including those not listed in the grant application (*HSC* Section 104559).**

A signature by the Superintendent or Designee on the Grant Application Cover Sheet and on the Assurances certifies that the entities identified in the application will meet the tobacco-free school district and CDE requirements pursuant to *HSC* Section 104420(n)(2).

#### Project Monitoring and Evaluation

The Project Monitoring and Evaluation Section should clearly identify a project monitoring and evaluation plan that will be implemented by the lead agency or applicant. This section has two components:

1. **Project Monitoring Plan.** Applicants are required to provide a project monitoring plan that consists of measurable objectives, identifies the cycle of program evaluation and improvement for each of the relevant narrative sections, and maintain a CHKS tracking toolkit.
2. **CHKS.** A local tracking mechanism must be established to monitor the CHKS administration of participating school districts to enable a local TUPE Program to evaluate its program effectiveness across time in comparison to itself, other districts, counties, and the state. Grantees will be required to maintain a consolidated grantee-level record and provide its monitoring results upon CDE request. The CDE will provide a CHKS tracking toolkit in which applicants must identify a list of participating counties, districts, and schools, estimated administration dates, lead staff for data collection, and the compliance monitoring process that will ensure school compliance.

#### Tobacco-Use Prevention Education Program Administration and Staffing

The TUPE Program Administration and Staffing Section consists of a form in which applicants will identify administrative and direct service staff and provide their indirect costs. Personnel in this section includes the Project Coordinator, Administrative Staff, Clerical Staff, and Direct Service Staff.

#### Assurances

The Assurances Section of the RFA requires applicants to upload various documents with signatures into the TUPE GEMS. Documents include:

##### Certified Assurances

The applicant’s Superintendent or Designee must certify that they have read, acknowledge, and agree to the terms as stated in this RFA, and all terms in accordance with the *HSC* and California *Education Code* as identified in the Grant Certified Assurances Section in the TUPE GEMS. The Superintendent/Designee signature represents the acceptance of all conditions as stated in the Grant Application Cover Sheet, the Budget Summary, all general and certified program assurances, and forms contained in the TUPE GEMS not requiring individual signature.

Each successful grantee must provide General Assurances and Certifications as a condition of receiving CDE funds. Applicants do not need to sign and upload the General Assurances and Certification with the application; instead, immediately following notice of award, each successful grantee must download the updated General Assurances and Certifications and retain copies of signed documents for their records and for audit purposes. Please visit the CDE General Assurances and Certifications web page at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/fo/fm/ff.asp>.

##### Program Assurances

The applicant agency, on behalf of the school districts and any schools identified in the application, must also certify that they will adhere to the following TUPE Program assurances (this is part of the certification statement on the Grant Application Cover Sheet):

1. Enforce the Tobacco-Free School Policy as described in *HSC* Section 104420(n)(2).
2. Neither receive, nor apply for funds, educational materials, or services from the tobacco, vaping, or marijuana industry or any agency which has received funding from the tobacco, vaping, or marijuana industry to implement tobacco-use prevention or intervention programs.
3. Administer the district-level CHKS Core Module as described in this RFA under CHKS Requirements.
4. Participate in external evaluations by researchers as described in this RFA under CHKS Requirements.
5. Participate, if selected, as a reader for subsequent cohorts of TUPE competitive grants.
6. Implement a systemic and ongoing process to (1) collect data; (2) ensure that the program resulting from the grant process is being implemented as planned; and (3) measure the effectiveness of the Program Plan in achieving the expected result (as applicable by grant type).
7. Implement the program as described in the approved application or receive written permission from the CDE prior to implementing any changes to the approved application.
8. Expend funds as detailed in the approved application unless specifically approved by the CDE.
9. Submit all the required deliverables by the designated due dates to ensure the program remains in good standing with the TUPE Office.
10. Submit the required TUPE Tobacco-Free School District Certification form prior to July 1 and maintain that status throughout the duration of the grant.

##### Memorandum of Understanding

The applicant must upload a current MOU between the LEA and any community organization(s) or agency that will take an active part in carrying out or administering the proposed project. The role of the consortia lead (if applicable) must be clearly described between the consortia lead and consortia member agencies. The MOU must describe how the partner agency and/or organization(s) will participate in the project, describe the roles and responsibilities of the partners, service levels, and number of staff involved.

An MOU is considered current if dated July 2019 or later. The MOU should be signed by the individual or designee most responsible for ensuring that the community organization and/or agency fulfills the TUPE project roles and responsibilities assigned to them.

##### Letter of Support

A letter of support must be uploaded from the applicant’s County TUPE Coordinator demonstrating the collaborative effort of implementing the program. The letter should be provided on the County Coordinator’s letterhead and contain an original “wet” signature. Only one letter of support is required for uploading into the TUPE GEMS.

##### Member Directory

The member directory consists of all participating districts and schools in the application beyond the primary applicant named on the Grant Application Cover Sheet. This includes the names, addresses, and contact information for the TUPE Coordinators at each district and school site identified in the application.

##### Equipment/Device Inventory

The equipment/device inventory is required for those applicants requesting the purchase of new equipment related to the TUPE Program. Equipment purchases over a $500 threshold such as laptops, Chromebooks, etc., should be provided on this form. Equipment purchased through a prior grant funding source should also be identified if the TUPE Program Plans to continue use of the previously purchased equipment (e.g., equipment, phones).

### Project Budget

The Project Budget should provide general Budget Summaries for the full three years of the grant period as well as individual FYs. The Project Budget is broken into eight program areas and requires a Budget Summary and Details. The specific program areas are: (1) Student Services, (2) Family and Community Engagement, (3) Staff Professional Development, (4) Interagency Partnerships, (5) LEA Technical Assistance, (6) Tobacco-Free Policy Development and Implementation, (7) Program Monitoring and Evaluation, and (8) TUPE Program and Administration Staffing.

A minimum of 25 percent of the overall funding should be allocated to Student Services or the application **will be** **disqualified.** Every dollar amount requested in the budget must be clearly and fully justified and be accompanied by a computation that includes a unit cost per service/budget item. Budgets must align with the Scope of Work described in the Application Narrative. The CDE will review all proposed budget items for clarity, reasonableness, and purpose. **Prior to funding, the CDE will screen for funding restriction costs and may reduce the amount requested in the application.**

### Reading and Scoring the Applications

#### Scoring Rubric

The Scoring Form and Rubric (see Appendix 1) is based on a percentage scale and covers each of the program areas as discussed in this RFA. Applications will generally score well if they provide: (1) accurate information on each of the data forms, (2) thorough and concise details in the narrative sections, and (3) precise and well-thought-out budgets. Applicants are encouraged to review the Scoring Form and Rubric as they develop their applications.

#### Good Standing

Currently funded TUPE grantees applying for a Tier 2 Grant must be in Good Standing with all existing TUPE grants. Good Standing for TUPE grantees refers to all of the following conditions having been met for each COE, district, direct funded charter school, and participating school sites included in the application:

* All program reports for the prior year’s grants (2018–19) have been submitted by the reporting deadline and have been found by the CDE to be substantially approvable (annual and semi-annual progress reports and year-end reports such as the TUPE Annual Service Report).
* All fiscal reports for the prior year’s grants (2018–19) have been submitted by the reporting deadline and have been found by the CDE to be substantially approvable (annual and semi-annual fiscal reports).

A grantee loses their Good Standing status when an “incident” occurs, meaning the late or non-submission of a progress or fiscal report as identified above. The CDE will review the number of incidents that occurred for a grantee during FY 2018–19. Grants dating before FY 2018–19 will not be evaluated.

The CDE will make the Good Standing determination for each submitted application independent of the reader review and scoring process. Once the readers have determined their scores and they are averaged together to reach a final score, the CDE will add points to the application based on the following Good Standing range:

* 0 incidents = 4 points
* 1–2 incidents = 3 points
* 3–4 incidents = 2 points
* 5–6 incidents = 1 point
* 7 or more incidents = 0 points

New applicants applying for TUPE funds are considered in Good Standing and will receive the maximum amount of four points. All applicants are expected to remain in Good Standing throughout the duration of all future grant terms, regardless of grant type.

**Note:** Future incidents will impact future grant application scores regardless of grant type.

#### Review and Scoring Process

The review and scoring process for Application Narratives will be conducted through the TUPE GEMS. The review process will consist of three stages: (1) the initial CDE screening, (2) reader review and online scoring of the narratives, and (3) the geographic funding determination.

* + - 1. CDE Screening. Each application will first be screened by the CDE to ensure that all technical requirements (forms, signatures, etc.), are met as required in this RFA. Each application successfully passing the initial CDE screening process will next move on to the reader review and online scoring of applications.
			2. Reader Review and Online Scoring. Each application will be read independently and scored online through the TUPE GEMS by two independent readers. Readers will be asked to evaluate the application to determine the extent to which the application meets the program areas identified in the Scoring Form and Rubric and whether the application adequately describes a quality program. Each section of the rubric will be scored as Outstanding (4 points), Comprehensive (3 points), Sufficient (2 points), Developing (1 point), or Weak (0 points).

If the independent readers agree that the application provides a concise description of a quality program (scoring either Outstanding, Comprehensive, or Sufficient), then the application will move forward in the review process for funding consideration. The scores of both readers will be added together and averaged to obtain the application’s final score, then ranked from highest to lowest score across all applications as described in the Geographic Funding Distribution Section.

In the case where readers are unable to reach consensus on the overall scoring, they will have an opportunity to discuss the application and re-score. If the readers are still unable to reach consensus, the application will be assigned to a third reader. The score from the third reader will be paired with the closest score from the original readers and then averaged to obtain the application’s final score. The CDE will then add Good Standing points to determine an application’s final score.

**Note:** Individual comments from reviewers will not be requested or provided to applicants. In addition, the professional judgment of the application reviewers will not be considered on appeal.

3. Geographic Funding Determination. Applications will be ranked from highest to lowest score in each of the six geographic funding categories (as identified by the applicant on the Grant Application Cover Sheet), and funded accordingly.

If there are more applications than available funds within a geographic funding category, applications will be ordered based on final score first, then highest to lowest ADA. If there are two equal ADA values within a geographic funding category, then the averaged score (as determined by the readers) for the Student Services Section (see Application Forms and Narrative Components) will be used as a tiebreaker. If the score of the Student Services Section is a tie, then the Family and Community Engagement Section score will be utilized. This process will continue sequentially through all of the rubric elements and until all funds are exhausted.

Upon successful completion of the review and scoring process, the CDE will post an ITA funding list for each of the six geographic funding categories on the CDE TUPE Funding Results web page at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ls/he/at/tupefunding.asp>.

### Appeals Process

Applicants who wish to appeal the CDE Intent to Award list must submit a letter of appeal through the TUPE GEMS within 10 days of the CDE’s notification of the ITA. The letter of appeal must be submitted on the applicant agency’s letterhead and have an original “wet” signature in blue ink from the Superintendent or the Designee. Once signed, the letter of appeal must be uploaded to the TUPE GEMS with the originally signed letter mailed to the CDE. Late or emailed letters of appeal will not be accepted. **An electronic signature from the Superintendent or Designee will not be accepted for the appeal letter. Appeals not submitted through the TUPE GEMS will not be considered.**

Appeals are limited to the grounds that the CDE’s action(s) violated a state statute or regulation. The professional judgment of the application readers will not be considered on appeal. Comments will not be requested of, or provided by the readers.

The letter of appeal shall include:

1. A clear, concise statement of the action being appealed,
2. The state statute and/or regulation which the CDE is alleged to have violated,
3. The specific evidence being submitted to support the appeal, and
4. The specific remedy sought.

A final decision will be made by the CDE within 20 working days of the filing deadline for appeals. The decision shall be the final administrative action afforded to the appellant.

### Application Submission Elements

#### Intent to Submit an Application

Prospective applicants are required to upload an ITS Application Form into the TUPE GEMS no later than **February 14, 2020, at 5 p.m.** Late, mailed, or emailed ITS Forms will not be accepted. The ITS serves as a placeholder indicating an agency’s intent to submit a complete application; however, submission of the ITS Form does not obligate the agency to submit a complete application.

**Failure to upload the completed ITS Form by the due date and time will result in disqualification of the application from the reading and scoring process.** An email confirmation of receipt of the ITS Form will be sent to the contact person identified on the form through the TUPE GEMS.

#### Complete Application

A full and complete Tier 2 Grant application and required forms must be uploaded into the TUPE GEMS no later than **March 18, 2020, at 5 p.m.** Late, mailed, or emailed applications will not be accepted.

The Grant Application Cover Sheet Form must include the authorized signature from the Superintendent or Designee. A Designee may provide the authorized signature as long as a copy of a recent governing board resolution or minutes, specifically authorizing the Designee to accept and sign as a proxy for financial statements and legally binding documents, is uploaded with the application materials. In the absence of an authorized signature or board resolution, the applicant will be disqualified. An electronic signature is acceptable for the Superintendent or Designee.

**Note:** Submission of an application packet constitutes consent to a release of information and waiver of the applicant’s right to privacy with regard to information provided in response to this RFA. Ideas and format contained in the application will become the property of the CDE.

#### Upload Instructions for the Tobacco-Use Prevention Education Grant Electronic Management System

Applicants may access the TUPE GEMS at [https://tupegems.ucsd.edu](https://tupegems.ucsd.edu/).

### Appendix 1: Scoring Form and Rubric

| **Rubric Category** | **Weighted** |
| --- | --- |
| Student Services | 25% |
| Family and Community Engagement | 10% |
| Staff Professional Development | 15% |
| Interagency Partnerships | 5% |
| Local Educational Agency (LEA) Technical Assistance | 8% |
| Tobacco-Free Policy Development and Implementation | 5% |
| Project Monitoring and Evaluation | 12% |
| Tobacco-Use Prevention Education (TUPE) Program Administration and Staffing | 10% |
| Budgets (8) | 10% |
| **Total** | 100% |

Each of the rubric categories will be evaluated by the readers based on the quality of the response and the justification provided for each question in the category. Scores may range from Outstanding (4 points), Comprehensive (3 points), Sufficient (2 points), Developing (1 point), or Weak (0 points), and are based on the following defining criteria:

* **Outstanding:** The response is very clear, extremely detailed and relevant, and presents a compelling argument supporting the proposal and the intent of the program.
* **Complete:** The response is clear and detailed and presents a persuasive argument supporting the proposal and the intent of the program.
* **Sufficient:** The response addresses the question(s) adequately, provides support for the proposal, and supports the intent of the program.
* **Developing:** The response partially addresses the questions, provides limited support for the proposal, or partially supports the intent of the program.
* **Weak:** The response does not address the question(s) or a response was not provided. The information does not provide any understanding of the applicant’s intent, provides limited program information, or does not support the intent of the program.

| **Student Services** | **Outstanding** | **Complete** | **Sufficient** | **Developing** | **Weak** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| To what extent does the project abstract provide a realistic overview of the proposed student services across all three years of the grant? | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** | **0** |
| To what extent is the data supportive of why the identified need was selected for the student services? | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** | **0** |
| To what extent is the selected curriculum/training materials justified in addressing the student services?  | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** | **0** |
| To what extent are the measurable objectives realistic and adequate to determine whether the impact of the proposed services will be met? | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** | **0** |
| To what extent are the proposed assessment tools able to collect quality and adequate data to assess the effectiveness of the services provided? | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** | **0** |
| To what extent are the planned service timelines and staffing realistic to address the needs of the services? | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** | **0** |
| **Total** |  |  |  |  |  |

| **Family and Community Engagement** | **Outstanding** | **Complete** | **Sufficient** | **Developing** | **Weak** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| To what extent does the project abstract provide a realistic overview of the proposed family and community engagement services across all three years of the grant? | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** | **0** |
| To what extent is the data supportive of why the identified need was selected for family and community engagement services? | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** | **0** |
| To what extent is the selected curriculum/training materials justified in addressing the family and community engagement services?  | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** | **0** |
| To what extent are the measurable objectives realistic and adequate to determine whether the impact of the proposed services will be met? | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** | **0** |
| To what extent are the proposed assessment tools able to collect quality and adequate data to assess the effectiveness of the services provided? | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** | **0** |
| To what extent are the planned service timelines and staffing realistic to address the needs of the services? | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** | **0** |
| **Total** |  |  |  |  |  |

| **Staff Professional Development** | **Outstanding** | **Complete** | **Sufficient** | **Developing** | **Weak** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| To what extent does the project abstract provide a realistic overview of the proposed staff professional development services across all three years of the grant? | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** | **0** |
| To what extent is the data supportive of why the identified need was selected for the staff professional development services? | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** | **0** |
| To what extent is the selected curriculum/training materials justified in addressing the staff professional development services?  | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** | **0** |
| To what extent are the measurable objectives realistic and adequate to determine whether the impact of the proposed services will be met? | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** | **0** |
| To what extent are the proposed assessment tools able to collect quality and adequate data to assess the effectiveness of the services provided? | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** | **0** |
| To what extent are the planned service timelines and staffing realistic to address the needs of the services? | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** | **0** |
| **Total** |  |  |  |  |  |

| **Interagency Partnerships** | **Outstanding** | **Complete** | **Sufficient** | **Developing** | **Weak** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| To what extent does the applicant demonstrate strong collaborative partnerships that will be supportive of the program moving forward? | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** | **0** |
| To what extent do the collaborative activities support the expected outcomes? | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** | **0** |
| To what extent do the proposed actions and timeline support the delivery of the outcomes? | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** | **0** |
| **Total** |  |  |  |  |  |

| **Local Educational Agency Technical Assistance** | **Outstanding** | **Complete** | **Sufficient** | **Developing** | **Weak** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| To what extent does the applicant demonstrate a clear understanding of the technical assistance needs from its LEAs (in the case of Consortium applicants) or its own technical assistance needs to be met by its County Office of Education TUPE Coordinator (in the case of a school district applicant)? | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** | **0** |
| To what extent are the proposed technical assistance activities adequate to address the identified needs? | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** | **0** |
| To what extent are the measurable objectives and assessment tools realistic and adequate to measure the objectives for the activities? | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** | **0** |
| **Total** |  |  |  |  |  |

| **Tobacco-Free Policy Development and Implementation** | **Outstanding** | **Complete** | **Sufficient** | **Developing** | **Weak** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| To what extent does the information provided demonstrate that the applicant will comply with the Tobacco-Free Policy Certification requirement? | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** | **0** |
| Describe the protocols you have in place for addressing tobacco violations at your school(s). | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** | **0** |
| To what extent are the actions proposed for the communication to staff, students, family, and community adequate? | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** | **0** |
| To what extent are the actions proposed to ensure effective policy implementation at school sites and school sponsored events adequate? | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** | **0** |
| **Total** |  |  |  |  |  |

| **Project Monitoring and Evaluation** | **Outstanding** | **Complete** | **Sufficient** | **Developing** | **Weak** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| To what extent does the applicant demonstrate a solid structure of data collection and evaluation? | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** | **0** |
| To what extent does the applicant establish reasonable goals/outcomes by general program areas? | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** | **0** |
| To what extent does the applicant demonstrate a complete plan for program evaluation and improvement?  | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** | **0** |
| To what extent does the applicant specifically identify structures to ensure continuous program improvement in succeeding grant years? | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** | **0** |
| To what extent does the applicant specifically identify a local tracking mechanism to monitor the California Healthy Kids Survey (CHKS) administration by participating school districts?  | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** | **0** |
| To what extent does the applicant provide a CHKS compliance monitoring process to ensure schools are complying? | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** | **0** |
| **Total** |  |  |  |  |  |

| **Tobacco-Use Prevention Education Program Administration and Staffing** | **Outstanding** | **Complete** | **Sufficient** | **Developing** | **Weak** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| To what extent are the number of administrative and direct services staff identified reasonable for the proposed project? | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** | **0** |
| To what extent are the indirect charges used for appropriate program support activities? | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** | **0** |
| **Total** |  |  |  |  |  |

| **Budgets** | **Outstanding** | **Complete** | **Sufficient** | **Developing** | **Weak** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| The budget detail for Student Services is complete and reasonable. | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** | **0** |
| The budget detail for Family and Community Engagement is complete and reasonable. | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** | **0** |
| The budget detail for Staff Professional Development is complete and reasonable. | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** | **0** |
| The budget detail for Interagency Partnerships is complete and reasonable. | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** | **0** |
| The budget detail for LEA Technical Assistance is complete and reasonable. | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** | **0** |
| The budget detail for Tobacco-Free Policy Development and Implementation is complete and reasonable. | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** | **0** |
| The budget detail for Project Monitoring and Evaluation is complete and reasonable. | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** | **0** |
| The budget detail for TUPE Program Administration and Staffing is complete and reasonable. | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** | **0** |
| **Total** |  |  |  |  |  |