

## LCR3EF GRANT RUBRIC

15 points	13-15 points	9-12 points	5-8 points	1 - 4 points	0 points
<b>Project Description</b>	Clear, concise and detailed description that addresses a stated need. Uses of funds specifically addressed.	Rambling description of project and need. Uses of funds generally addressed.	Incomplete description of project and need. Uses of funds minimally addressed.	Vague or unclear description of project and need. Uses of funds minimally addressed.	No description and need are presented.
10 points	8-10 points	5-7 points	3-4 points	1 - 2 points	0 points
<b>Improvement Plan Coherence</b>	Clear, detailed explanation of how this grant will meet stated strategies of CSIP goals along with stated BLIP goals or WIGs. Strong, direct coherence with current plan goals.	Explanation of how this grant will meet stated strategies of CSIP goals along with stated BLIP goals or WIGs. General coherence with current plan goals.	Incomplete explanation of how this grant will meet stated strategies of CSIP goals along with stated BLIP goals or WIGs. Minimal coherence with current plan goals.	No explanation of how this grant will meet stated strategies of CSIP goals along with stated BLIP goals or WIGs. Unclear coherence with current plan goals.	CSIP, BLIP, and WIG goals are not stated. No coherence with current plan goals is presented.
15 points	13-15 points	9-12 points	5-8 points	1 - 4 points	0 points
<b>Timeline</b>	All steps are included (e.g. purchasing, training, set-up, organizing, planning, assessing, reporting). Clear and defined dates that are attainable.	A few steps are missing. Less Detail. Clear, defined dates.	Multiple steps are missing. Detail is lacking. Clear, defined dates.	Major steps are missing. Unclear or unrealistic dates.	No timeline included.
15 points	13-15 points	9-12 points	5-8 points	1 - 4 points	0 points
<b>Research</b>	Clear, concise discussion of referenced information (research, case studies, examples, etc.) that support the need and potential success of the grant. Sources must be reliable and relate directly to the grant and instruction level.	Disorganized or rambling discussion of referenced information (research, case studies, examples, etc.) that support the need and potential success of the grant. Sources must be reliable and relate directly to the grant and instruction level.	Discussion of referenced information (research, case studies, examples, etc.) from reliable sources that only generally relates to the grant and instruction level.	Discussion of information from unreliable sources or information that is largely unsupported. Information does not directly apply to the grant and instruction level.	No information is provided or all information is in attachment only.
20 points	16-20 points	11-15 points	5-10 points	1 - 4 points	0 points
<b>Objective Measurements</b>	Clear outline of measurable objectives, data collection methods, and benchmarks that address the stated need. Metrics adequately measure the objectives. Methods to measure the stated metrics are detailed and obtainable. Grant success is well defined.	Outline of measurable objectives, data collection methods, and benchmarks that address the stated need. Metrics partially measure the objectives. Methods to measure the stated metrics lack clarity, detail, or completeness; but are obtainable. Grant success is defined.	General outline of measurable objectives, data collection methods, and benchmarks that address the stated need. Metrics only roughly measure the objectives. Methods to measure the stated metrics lack clarity, detail, or completeness; but are obtainable. Grant success is partially defined.	Disorganized measurable objectives, data collection methods, and benchmarks. The stated need is minimally addressed. Metrics do not adequately measure the objectives. Methods to measure the stated metrics are unpracticable. Grant success is poorly defined.	Project objectives, methods, and benchmarks are missing or do not address the need. Methods to measure metrics are unobtainable. Grant success is not defined.
10 points	8-10 points	5-7 points	3-4 points	1 - 2 points	0 points
<b>Student Impact</b>	Clear, concise description of impacts on students with well-defined and recognizable benefits. Benefits are a direct result of the grant.	General description of impacts on students with recognizable benefits. Benefits are a general result of the grant.	Rambling description of impacts on students with general benefits. Benefits are a general result of the grant.	Minimal description of impacts lacking focus on students with unclear benefits. The relationship of benefits to the grant is unclear.	Benefits to students are not addressed. Benefits do not result from the grant.
15 points	13-15 points	9-12 points	5-8 points	1 - 4 points	0 points
<b>Budget</b>	Detailed items and descriptions listed with confirmed costs. All budgetary items addressed (e.g. training, shipping). Needed details on additional funding and future expenses are addressed. Budget items meet the stated need.	Detailed items with descriptions listed with estimated costs. Most budgetary items addressed. Needed details on additional funding and future expenses are lacking. Budget items meet the stated need.	Items listed with estimated costs. Some budgetary items addressed. Needed details on additional funding and future expenses lacking. Budget items meet the stated need. Calculation errors.	Generic items listed with estimated costs. Few budgetary items addressed. Needed details on additional funding and future expenses are missing. Budget items only generally meet the stated need. Costs are NOT in US dollars. Calculation errors.	Budget is missing and no detail is given. Budget items do not meet the stated need.