



Issaquah Schools Foundation Grant Application Judging Rubric 2011-2012

Please judge the grants based on the criteria below. Read through each section and score based on the scale below. A total of 80 points is possible for each application.

Scores then will be weighted by ISF: Student Benefits (x2), Evaluation and Recognition (x2); Application Quality scores retain their original value. Weighted scores are added for a final score.

Acronyms:

- EALRs. - Essential Academic Learning Requirements. Defined expectations for student achievement
- GLEs - Grade Level Expectations

STUDENT BENEFITS (x2)

Innovative and/or Compelling

7-10 points: The application conveys a new idea that may not have been tried at all or in this way before, and/or addresses a specific, compelling need. It clearly articulates the potential to impact student learning in a significant way. The potential benefits are clearly conveyed.

4-6 points: The application does not as clearly articulate an increased benefit to students, and/or is not innovative. The breadth and depth of effectiveness is limited.

1-3 points: The application does not demonstrate innovation or a compelling need and/or the benefits to students are not understandable.

Student Engagement

7-10 points: The application clearly articulates how this grant will engage students by providing hands on learning, real world experience, and/or a connection to their future. The project offers an opportunity to excite student interest in the subject matter or engender interest in a new way.

4-6 points: The application describes a program that may be somewhat interesting for students, but does not appear to be as powerfully engaging as other programs.

1-3 points: The application does not engage students in learning in any active way.

Impactful/ Enduring Outcomes

7-10 points: The application clearly articulates the impact this grant will have on students, providing complete, understandable and measureable student outcomes. The benefits

reach a broad range of students or deeply enhance the learning of a small number of students, the results of which can be clearly identified and articulated. It offers a potential for students to learn lessons that will remain with them for many years.

4-6 points: The application will affect a somewhat limited number of students (one classroom or less) or have a limited impact on those students it touches. The results will be hard to articulate.

1-3 points: The application is very limited in its impact on students. It could only be used in one classroom and does not articulate any enduring outcome.

Sustainable/Expandable/Tied to Curriculum

7-10 points: This project offers concrete lessons that are essential building blocks to expanded learning across one or more curricular areas. The project may be sustainable for several years with little additional funding. It is a pilot program that shows potential for easy expansion across other classrooms/schools. The application clearly articulates ties to curriculum goals and references only those EALRs and GLEs that are most directly affected by the grant. The application articulates how it enhances student learning via new methods to be used within the curriculum.

4-6 points: The application describes benefits that are limited to two years at most. The project may be difficult to expand to other areas or schools. The application references EALRs or GLEs but is vague or doesn't make a clear tie to how the application will affect them.

1-3 points: The application is for a very limited period of time (one year or less), and/or could only be used in one classroom or is dependent upon the unique skills and/or interests of one particular teacher. It is not something that would expand to other areas or schools. The application has little to no reference to curriculum and/or how it will enhance any EALRs or GLEs.

EVALUATION AND RECOGNITION (x2)

Outcomes and Evaluation

7-10 points: The application has a clear plan for evaluating the effectiveness of the grant with understandable and measureable outcomes. There is a baseline to start from and clear points of assessment throughout for which the results can be clearly identified and articulated. If methodology is explained in the application, the steps and conclusions make sense and the outcomes are outlined and flow reasonably from the methods proposed. There is a clear plan for measuring success and method for providing feedback to ISF.

4-6 points: The application has a limited plan for evaluating the grant. There is not a clear baseline and/or the outcomes are difficult to measure. They have some method for providing feedback to ISF, but it may not be clear and/or measurable.

1-3 points: The application has no evaluation plan. There are no measurable outcomes identified, and there is little or no method for providing feedback to ISF.

ISF Recognition

7-10 points: The application identifies a great potential for a highly visible program that may appeal to donors and is something ISF can promote in the community. It identifies methods for creating visibility for ISF and can potentially be showcased at the NEM luncheon to help promote similar programs in the future. It could be worthy of a news article.

4-6 points: The application has limited potential for visibility but over time could build into something that ISF can promote. The application is limited to one classroom or school with limited visibility in the greater community.

1-3 points: The application does not identify how it could be promoted or how ISF would be recognized.

APPLICATION QUALITY

Conventions, Clarity and Completeness

7-10 points: The application is clear, complete and concise. Spelling and grammar are correct, and attention has been paid to details. The application is quite thorough and it is easy to gain a clear understanding as to what they are requesting. Any technology has been approved by the District, or the writer has adequately justified the use of non-standard technology.

4-6 points: The application is unclear and/or uses undefined terms. The application seems to have potential gaps in logic or is missing some information. You have questions around some areas of the request.

1-3 point: The application is quite vague and/or elements of it seem unrealistic. The application seems very sparse and needs lots of additional details.

Accuracy

7-10 points: The application appears accurate. The budget appears complete. The numbers tie with the proposed expenses and tax is calculated as applicable. Details are consistent throughout, and the request to ISF is within the grant limit.

4-6 points: The application has a few minor mistakes or inconsistencies. The budget and/or grammar may contain some minor errors.

1-3 point: The application has several mistakes with regards to clarity, grammar, and/or accuracy. The budget appears to be a guess or exceeds the grant limit.