Program Scoring Rubric

	Rubric Question	Consider information from these sections of the application	Score (0-5)	Weight
INNOVATION				
1	How well does the proposed project offer a bold and innovative solution to a clearly identified problem or situation?	Project Summary; Project Description; Project Execution and Sustainability; Substantial Impact and Lasting Value	0-5	
2	How clearly is this innovative solution described in the application materials?	Project Summary; Project Description; Project Execution and Sustainability; Substantial Impact and Lasting Value	0-5	
3	How impressive and reasonable are the expected outcomes anticipated to be achieved by this project?	Project Summary; Total students directly impacted; Outcomes listed in question 9; Relationship between number of students impacted, extent of impact as described in outcomes and size of grant as reported in Questions 11 and 12	0-5	
4	How strong is the underlying rationale for the selection of this innovation?	Questions 8, 9	0-5	
5	How convincing is the link between research cited and the proposed project?	Project Description	0-5	
6	How significant and realistic are the expected instructional and/or organizational changes in terms of accomplishing the project goals?	Project Description; Question 24	0-5	
PROGRAMMATIC SUSTAINABILITY				
7	How adequate are the qualifications, skills and experience of the participants to implement this innovation?	Applicant Information; Project Execution and Sustainability	0-5	
8	To what extent are the roles of collaborators, partners and key individuals clearly delineated in terms of planning, implementing and evaluating the work of this project?	Applicant Information; Project Execution and Sustainability	0-5	
9	How completely does the proposal describe the project timeline, including clear benchmarks for completion in planning, implementation and evaluation?	Project Execution and Sustainability; Substantial Impact and Lasting Value	0-5	
10	How completely has this project planned for the engagement of all key stakeholders in order to maximize both initial buy-in and institutionalization of change?	Project Description; Project Execution and Sustainability; Substantial Impact and Lasting Value	0-5	
11	How completely has the applicant described a coherent plan for achieving all needed consent of applicable officers and governing bodies (Superintendent, Treasurers, Board of Education, Charter School sponsor, Union Representative)?	Project Description; Project Execution and Sustainability; Substantial Impact and Lasting Value	0-5	

12	To what extent do project activities and partners correlate with one another to develop an interdependent system of changes?	Project Description; Project Execution and Sustainability; Substantial Impact and Lasting Value	0-5	
13	To what extent has the applicant planned for ongoing communication between project leaders and project implementers?	Project Description; Project Execution and Sustainability	0-5	
FISCAL EFFECTIVENESS AND EFFICIENCY				
14	How reasonable is the requested budget given the number of students directly impacted, outcomes expected (consider all goals selected) and the lasting value of the project?	Ques. 3, 9, 12; Substantial Impact and Lasting Value	0-5	
15	If cost savings is selected as a goal, how robust and credible are the projected savings in the Financial Impact Table?	Question 9 b; FIT cost savings section; Questions 16, 17	NA, 0-5	
16	How convincing are the estimates of sustainability costs in terms of describing realistically the complete cost for ensuring the continuation of the project over the required time-frame?	Question 14; FIT	0-5	
17	How adequately does this proposal describe plans to ensure that sustainability costs will be met without an increase in the five-year-forecast (realistic estimates of cost savings plus reallocation of funds)?	Questions 16-20; FIT	0-5	
REPLICABILITY				
18	How well does the proposal provide evidence of how the applicant, consortium/partnership (if relevant) or member school(s) will communicate, administer and manage the project to successfully carry out the scope of work for the term of the project and serve as an example for others?	Project Execution and Sustainability	0-5	
19	How strong is the proposed evaluation plan to assess the process of implementation as well as measuring trends from baseline through improvement in terms of the goals identified in the proposal?	Questions 9, 25, 26	0-5	
20	How robust and clearly defined are the specific outcome measures selected for each goal chosen by this project?	Question 9	0-5	
21	How clearly have the project planners envisioned a role for implementers in sharing lessons learned through this project?	Project Execution and Sustainability, Question 27	0-5	
22	How well does this proposal describe an innovation with likely application beyond this project?	Project Description; Substantial Impact and Lasting Value; Question 27	0-5	

Program Scoring Definitions

Score	Description
0	**Inadequate**: No evidence or information not provided
1	**Weak**: Minimal evidence; limited potential; vague; weak concepts; limited likelihood of success; limited in innovative thinking; lacks sufficient information
2	**Marginal**: Some evidence; partially developed concepts; some potential for effectiveness and success; some inconsistencies; needs work; some innovation present; requires additional information/clarification
3	**Good**: Convincing concepts with enough examples of evidence to indicate a good chance for success; clear and complete; innovative
4	**Strong**: Very convincing concepts with strong examples of evidence throughout; well-conceived and thoroughly developed with a high likelihood for success; very innovative
5	**Exemplary**: Excellent concepts; exceptional evidence; well-thought-out with an extremely high likelihood of success, highly innovative

This page intentionally left blank

	Fiscal Sustainability Scoring Rubric			
	Scored Option			
	Rubric Question	**Consider information from these sections of the application**	**Score**	**Weight**
1	How credible are the cost allocations for each sustainability year?	FIT section A and Question 14	0-5	1
2	How credible are the cost savings (if any) described for each sustainability year?	FIT Section B and Questions 9, 16, 17	NA, 0-5	1
3	How credible are the reallocations (if any) described for each sustainability year?	FIT Section C and Questions 18, 19	NA, 0-5	1
4	How reasonable is the total cost of this project considering the number of students impacted?	FIT Section D and Questions 3, 12	0-5	1
5	How reasonable is the total cost of this project considering the overall value of the innovation?	FIT Section D; Budget; Question 12; Project Description; Substantial Impact and Lasting Value	0-5	1
6	If applicable, how confident are you that this project will achieve cost savings that are permanent?	FIT Section B, Project Description, Budget and Sustainability; Substantial Impact and Lasting Value	NA, 0-5	1
7	If applicable, how confident are you that this project will achieve cost savings that are verifiable?	FIT Section B, Project Description, Budget and Sustainability; Substantial Impact and Lasting Value	NA, 0-5	1
8	How confident are you that this project can be sustained without additional income?	FIT , Project Description, Budget and Sustainability	0-5	1
9	How completely has the applicant supported and explained all numbers provided in the FIT?	FIT, Budget and Sustainability	0-5	1
10	How completely has the applicant demonstrated a full understanding of the sustainability concept with regard to this project?	FIT, Project Description, Budget and Sustainability	0-5	1
11	What is your overall confidence in the sustainability of this project?		0-5	50% of total

Fiscal Sustainability Scoring Definitions

Score	Description--Questions 1-10
0	**No Confidence**: No evidence or insufficient information provided to be able to make a sound judgment
1	**Weak Confidence**: Minimal evidence; vague, conflicting or incomplete explanation of costs and means of fiscally sustaining project; significant doubt that the planners fully understand or are committed to fiscal sustainability
2	**Marginal Confidence**: Some evidence of sustainability; partial explanation of FIT items; some inconsistencies; needs work; requires additional information/clarification
3	**Confident**: Convincing budget forecasts with enough explanation to indicate a good chance for success; clear and complete; fiscally responsible
4	**Strong Confidence**: Very convincing and complete budget forecasts with strong explanations throughout; well-conceived and thoroughly developed explanation of fiscal sustainability mechanisms
5	**Exceptional Confidence**: Strong linkage between budget and narrative; full and complete evidence of interaction between programmatic and fiscal planning; strong commitment to fiscal sustainability across required years
NA	This question does not apply to the proposed project (questions 2, 3, 6, only)

Score	Description--Questions 11
0	**Not Sustainable**: No evidence of sustainability or insufficient information provided to be able to make a sound judgment
1	**Likely Not Sustainable**: Minimal evidence; vague, conflicting or incomplete explanation of costs and means of fiscally sustaining project; significant doubt that the planners fully understand or are committed to fiscal sustainability
2	**Some Likelihood of Sustainability**: Some evidence of sustainability; partial explanation of FIT items; some inconsistencies; needs work; requires additional information/clarification
3	**Moderate Likelihood of Sustainability**: Convincing budget forecasts with enough explanation to indicate a good chance for success; clear and complete; fiscally responsible
4	**Strong Likelihood of Sustainability**: Very convincing and complete budget forecasts with strong explanations throughout; well-conceived and thoroughly developed explanation of fiscal sustainability mechanisms
5	**Complete Confidence in Sustainability**: Strong linkage between budget and narrative; full and complete evidence of interaction between programmatic and fiscal planning; strong commitment to fiscal sustainability across required years