Chicago Foundation for Education -- Small Grant Application Scoring Rubric

Evaluation Criteria	4 = Strongly Agree	3 = Agree	2 = Somewhat Agree	1 = Somewhat Disagree	0 = Disagree
1. Project is clearly summarized.	Description of project is clear and detailed.	Description provides reader with sufficient understanding of project.	Description is lacking specifics, but reader is able to gain a vague understanding of project.	Description is insufficient, with reader unable to gain even a vague understanding of project.	No description of project is provided.
2. Key activities are clearly outlined.	Key activities are clearly outlined and have been thoughtfully crafted.	Key activities are outlined.	Activities are listed, but are not clear or well-crafted.	Activities are vague and/or very minimal in scope.	No activities are identified.
3. Project activities are engaging.	Project activities are engaging and likely to entice students to actively participate.	Project activities seem engaging.	Project activities seem somewhat engaging, but applicant does not clearly describe them.	Project activities seem unlikely to engage students.	Project activities will not engage students.
4. Specific student learning needs addressed by this project are described clearly and thoroughly.	Applicant has thoughtfully identified specific learning needs that are unique to the group of students targeted by the project (i.e. "My students need to improve reading comprehension/graphing/social skills, as shown by their test scores...").	Applicant describes learning needs to be addressed by project. However, the needs seem to be general school or district objectives, as opposed to specific to his/her student population.	Applicant only generically describes learning needs addressed by the project (i.e. "Math and Science are important"). Does not mention that needs align specifically with students or school/district objectives.	Applicant mentions learning needs, but does not correlate them to this project.	Applicant does not address student learning needs.
5. This project clearly aligns with IL Learning Standards, Common Core State Standards (CCSS), SEL State Standards, and/or Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS).	Applicant clearly and thoughtfully aligns project with Illinois Learning Standards, Common Core State Standards, SEL State Standards, and/or Next Generation Science Standards.	Applicant somewhat aligns project with Illinois Learning Standards, Common Core State Standards, SEL State Standards, and/or Next Generation Science Standards.	Applicant mentions Illinois Learning Standards, Common Core State Standards, SEL State Standards, and/or Next Generation Science Standards, but does not explain clearly how the proposed project will incorporate these standards.	Applicant is unclear or vague with regard to the focal Illinois Learning Standards, Common Core State Standards, SEL State Standards, and/or Next Generation Science Standards.	Applicant does not mention Illinois Learning Standards, Common Core State Standards, SEL State Standards, and/or Next Generation Science Standards.
6. Formal and informal evaluation tools are identified.	Applicant addresses the specific evaluation tools that will be used with the project, and identifies a variety of formal and informal means of learning assessment.	Applicant clearly identifies at least one formal and one informal evaluation tool that will be used with the project.	Applicant clearly identifies either one formal or one informal tool for evaluation, but not both.	Applicant vaguely identifies only one tool for evaluation.	Applicant does not provide information on any formal or informal evaluation tools.
7. The project's impact on student learning is addressed and detailed.	Applicant clearly explains how the proposed project will have a positive impact on student learning.	Applicant satisfactorily explains how the proposed project will have a positive impact on student learning.	Applicant somewhat explains how the proposed project will have a positive impact on student learning.	Applicant notes that the proposed project will have a positive impact on student learning, but does not explain how.	Applicant does not answer this question.
8. Budget is itemized, specific, and complete.	Budget is complete and specific, items correspond to application, and sources/prices have been researched.	Budget is complete and items correspond to application.	Budget is complete, but items do not correspond to application **or** sources/costs seem to be estimated rather than researched.	Budget is complete, but items do not correspond to application **and** sources/costs seem to be estimated rather than researched.	Budget is incomplete.
9. The need for budget items is compelling.	Applicant provides a thoughtful, persuasive rationale as to why budget items are essential to project implementation.	Applicant provides a satisfactory rationale as to why budget items are necessary for project implementation.	Applicant describes how budget items will benefit students generally, but does not clearly explain why they are necessary for this project.	Applicant vaguely describes how budget items will benefit students generally, and does not explain why the items are necessary for this project.	Applicant does not answer this question.
10. The application is clearly written and free of spelling, grammatical, and typographical errors.	Application is well-presented, is articulately written, and is free of spelling, grammatical, and/or typographical errors.	Application is clearly written and has few spelling, grammatical, and/or typographical errors.	Application is somewhat articulate and has few spelling, grammatical, and/or typographical errors, but does not appear to have been proof-read.	Application is not clearly written **or** contains numerous spelling, grammatical, and/or typographical errors.	Presentation of application is unacceptable.