



# Rubric: Mastery-Based Education Grant Application

2022-2023

## PURPOSE

This scoring rubric will help the SDE grant review committee consistently and fairly evaluate grant applications. It will also help grant writers understand the scoring process. Each part of the 2-page application itself is considered.

## Page 1: Essential Information

Completion only:

- Grant Manager identified.
- Funding requested
- Appropriate Signatures included (currently on page 3 of application)

School: \_\_\_\_\_

Grant Title: \_\_\_\_\_

System-wide Change \_\_\_\_\_ or Project: \_\_\_\_\_

## Page 2: Application Narrative

Descriptive Summary: \_\_\_\_ Score

2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description clear, succinct, and easily understood in one reading</li> <li>• Goals/outcomes easily identified and connected to description</li> <li>• Framework / Student Driven Learning practices clearly identified and intentionally connected</li> </ul>
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description contains ambiguous or somewhat vague language</li> <li>• Goals appear to overlap or are unmeasurable; not fully in sync with the description</li> <li>• Connections to the Framework or SDL practices implied, but not clearly made</li> </ul>
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description missing or confusing; evaluator has clarifying questions after reading it</li> <li>• Goals not expressed</li> <li>• Connections to the Framework or SDL practices missing</li> </ul>
Evaluator Comments:	

**Need: \_\_\_\_ Score**

2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need clearly described with data or anecdotal evidence; easily understood in one reading</li> <li>• Need is student centered, with a clear instructional, assessment, or learning culture focus</li> </ul>
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need is challenging to identify; contains ambiguous or vague language; lacking evidence</li> <li>• Need is student adjacent, with minimal connection to instruction, assessment, or learning culture</li> </ul>
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need difficult to identify; implied; evaluator has multiple clarifying questions after reading, not evidence</li> <li>• Need irrelevant to students; no connection to instruction, assessment, or learning culture</li> </ul>
<p>Evaluator Comments:</p>	

**Objectives: \_\_\_\_ Score**

2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outcomes/benefits/change/purpose clearly defined or described in addition to being measurable</li> <li>• Objectives are measurable</li> <li>• Connections to larger school or district goals clearly made</li> </ul>
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outcomes/benefits/change/purpose challenging to identify with limited explanation of how to measure or identify effect.</li> <li>• Limited measurability</li> <li>• Limited connections to larger school or district objectives.</li> </ul>
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outcomes/benefits/change/purpose confusing or ambiguous;</li> <li>• Missing measurability</li> <li>• No connections to larger district or school objectives</li> </ul>
<p>Evaluator Comments:</p>	

**Process: \_\_\_ Score**

2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• How to accomplish grant objectives is clearly articulated</li><li>• Pertinent responsibilities, resources, collaborative efforts, clearly outlined</li><li>• Evaluator has minimal clarifying questions</li></ul>
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• How the grant objectives will be accomplished includes ambiguous components</li><li>• Pertinent responsibilities, resources, collaborative efforts, muddy or unclear</li><li>• General process understood by evaluator, but questions identified</li></ul>
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Process is unclear or misaligned to previous application components</li><li>• Responsibilities not identified</li><li>• Many process questions sparked during initial reading</li></ul>
Evaluator Comments:	

**Timeline: \_\_\_ Score**

2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Potential dates and sequence of activities clearly outlined</li><li>• Potential progress indicators identified</li><li>• Spending plan in line with progress and year-end report dates</li></ul>
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Potential dates and sequences of activities overlap or seem out of alignment</li><li>• Limited reference to progress indicators or measurability</li><li>• Questionable spending plan alignment with progress and year-end report dates</li></ul>
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Dates and sequence of activities missing or incomplete</li><li>• No milestones or progress indicators identified</li><li>• No reference to progress or year-end reports dates</li></ul>
Evaluator Comments:	

**Evaluation: \_\_\_\_ Score**

2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Appropriate metrics and methods for evaluating efforts clearly identified</li><li>• Responsibilities for evaluating and reporting clearly assigned.</li><li>• Appropriate connections to timelines and report dates clearly made</li></ul>
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Limited metrics; vague methods</li><li>• Accountability for evaluation not clear</li><li>• Limited connections to timelines and report dates</li></ul>
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Metrics and methods missing or misaligned and confusing</li><li>• No accountability measures identified</li><li>• No connections to timelines or report dates</li></ul>
Evaluator Comments:	

**Sustainability Plan: \_\_\_\_ Score**

2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Plan clearly describes multiple approaches or methods to sustain efforts or funding</li><li>• Acknowledges statute need for rubrics and assessments and describes a current or future plan to develop them</li></ul>
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Plan describes limited approaches or methods to sustain efforts or funding</li><li>• Limited acknowledgement or plan for developing rubrics and assessments</li></ul>
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Plan missing, misaligned or confusing</li><li>• No acknowledgement or plan for developing rubrics and assessments</li></ul>
Evaluator Comments:	

**Grant Funding Request--Spending: \_\_\_\_ Score**

2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whole dollar amount identified</li> <li>• Description of how funds will be spent is clear and reasonable</li> <li>• Spending fits within the six identified spending categories</li> </ul> <p><b>Note:</b> The midyear report will require an accounting of the dollar amount spent to that date. The final report requires a full accounting. The six spending categories include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Professional Development. This includes contracts with vendors, created and maintained by the district.</li> <li>2. Stipends. As noted earlier, funds from this grant should not replace district PD plans or expectations.</li> <li>3. Substitutes.</li> <li>4. Travel. Follow state guidelines for per diem.</li> <li>5. Equipment/Technology. Should directly support or relate to identified students or be used by students, including learner management systems.</li> <li>6. Supplies. Should directly support or be used by students</li> </ol>
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description of how funds will be spent has potential gaps or questionable requests</li> <li>• Spending misaligned to the six identified spending categories</li> </ul>
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description unclear or misaligned to other grant components</li> <li>• Request amount seems unreasonable or excessive, includes inaccuracies, and no regard to the spending categories</li> </ul>
<p>Evaluator Comments:</p>	

**Total Score: \_\_\_\_/16**

**Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_**