

BAKERSFIELD CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT EDUCATIONAL FOUNDATION

RUBRIC FOR SCORING ALL COMPETITIVE GRANTS (INCLUDING STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT GRANTS AND TECHNOLOGY GRANTS)

This scoring rubric provides a comprehensive set of quality statements of exemplary projects. This rubric has been adopted by the BCSD Educational Foundation and will be used to evaluate ALL competitive grant proposals. This rubric is designed to be a holistic description, not a checklist. Evaluators will assign the score that most clearly resembles the information provided in the application. On the right are the criteria. Across the page are examples of 4, 3, 2, and 1. The highest score an individual applicant can receive is 24. The highest score a partner/team applicant can receive is 28.

	4	3	2	1
1. The grant has a clearly defined need .	Addresses a critical need. Cites specific objective. States how project ties activities and educational outcomes.	Cites specific objective. how project ties to plan with activities and educational outcomes.	Cites specific objective. Specific objective not clearly linked to project activities and does not address a critical need.	No reference to plan or need.
2. The goal is defined and the outcomes are measurable.	The goal addresses a critical need and is obtainable. The educational outcomes are stated and are measurable.	The goal is defined with measurable outcomes. Goal links to a critical need and is obtainable.	The goal is defined. Outcomes are not clearly defined and cannot be measured effectively.	The goal and objectives are not clear. Goal is not obtainable.
3. The project's method provides an innovative approach to teaching the Standards.	Provides an innovative approach to teaching the Standard(s). Project compliments current existing curriculum and clearly cites the Standard(s). Educational items are outside the typical school purchases.	Provides an innovative approach to teaching the Standard(s). Project compliments current existing curriculum and clearly sites Standard(s).	Project does not provide an innovative approach. Request items that can be purchased from school budget. No Standard(s) cited.	Project departs from the existing curriculum. No Standard(s) cited.
4. The method identified is research based with specific measurable outcomes for evaluating success .	Uses current research to support educational method. Cites research and measurable outcomes in proposal. Gives specific example that relates directly to BCSD children.	Uses current research to support educational method. Cites research and measurable outcomes in proposal.	Current research is not clearly linked to educational outcomes and/or is not accurate.	No reference to research to support educational method.
5. The timeline includes all proposed grant activities.	Timeline is clearly stated with realistic dates that are obtainable. The activities listed are linked to timeline.	Timeline is clearly stated with realistic dates that are obtainable.	Timeline is not clear or realistic for successful completion of activities.	No timeline is present.
6. The budget request matches proposed activities.	Budget provides a break down of items with amounts thoroughly explained. The budget request matches proposed activities.	Budget provides a breakdown of items. The budget request matches proposed activities.	Budget items are not clear. Items are not broken down.	Budget items are not clear. Items are not broken down. Budget does not match proposed activities.
7. For partner/team applications only : Strengths and roles of each partner are adequately addressed.	Strengths and roles of each partner are clearly addressed with description of collaboration. Proposal describes how partnership will enhance educational outcomes and how items will be shared.	Strengths and roles of each partner are clearly addressed with description of collaboration.	Collaboration exists but description is not clear how partners will work together.	No collaboration is explained.