Appendix B: Grant Application Rubric

**NDE Form: 02-081**

**Date Approved: 12-14-16**



**Nebraska Department of Education**

**- INNOVATION GRANT APPLICATION REVIEW FORM -**

|  |
| --- |
| **- GRANT REVIEWER -** |
| **REVIEWER***(Name)* |  |
|  |  | **DATE REVIEWED** |  |
| **- GRANT APPLICANT AND PROPOSED PROJECT -** |
| **APPLICANT** *(Local Education Agency)* |  |
| **PROJECT TITLE** |  |
| **PRIORITY CONSIDERATION** *(Select ONLY ONE, with “X”)* | **TYPE OF INNOVATION GRANT** *(Phase I Development Grants ONLY)* |
| ***High Needs Students*** |  | ***Phase - I Development Grant*** |  |
| ***Students in “Needs Improvement” School*** |  | ***Phase II - Validation Grant*** |  |
| ***Focus on AQuESTT Tenets*** |  | ***Phase III - Scale-Up Grant*** |  |
| ***Leveraging Technology*** |  | **LENGTH OF GRANT** *(In Months - 30 Months Maximum)* | **30** |
| **OPTIONAL COMPETITIVE PREFERENCE PRIORITY: *Matching Funds*** *(% of Total Project Budget Amount - 25% Minimum)* | 25% |
| **- SELECTION CRITERIA -** | **Points** |
| ***SIGNIFICANCE*****(Up to 35 points)** | * Extent to which the project involves identification, development, or demonstration of an innovative promising practice or method that builds on, or is an alternative to, an existing process, product, strategy or intervention(s) addressing similar needs.
 | /5 |
| * Extent to which the project will, or is expected to, improve education outcomes for the student population(s) served, or improve transitions between successive stages of education or between education and the work force.
 | /10 |
| * Project’s potential for statewide significance.
 | /10 |
| * Project’s potential to be both replicable and scalable.
 | /10 |
| ***SUB-TOTAL:*** | **/35** |
| ***REVIEWER COMMENTS***: -***Grant Application’s Strengths:*** ***-Reviewer Suggestions:*** |
| ***QUALITY OF******PROJECT DESIGN******AND******MANAGEMENT PLAN*****(Up to 45 points)** | * Extent to which the project’s stated goal(s), objectives and targeted outcomes are clearly specified and measurable.
 | **/5** |
| * Adequacy of the *Project Management Plan* to achieve the project’s goals, objectives and outcomes, on time and within budget, based on clearly defined responsibilities, milestones and timelines for accomplishing project tasks.
 | **/5** |
| * Applicant’s capacity to successfully implement the project, on time and within budget.
 | **/10** |
| * Adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operations and evaluation of the project.
 | **/10** |
| * Extent to which the *Project Logic Model* provides a well-developed conceptual framework illustrating the relationships between the project’s key components, activities, outputs and targeted outcomes for the student population(s) served.
 | **/10** |
| * Adequacy of mechanisms for disseminating information about the project to support further development, expansion or validation.
 | **/5** |
| ***SUB-TOTAL:*** | **/45** |
| ***REVIEWER COMMENTS***: -***Grant Application’s Strengths:***  ***-Reviewer Suggestions:***   |

|  |
| --- |
| **- GRANT APPLICANT AND PROPOSED PROJECT -** |
| **APPLICANT** *(Local Education Agency)* |  |
| **PROJECT TITLE** |  |
| **- SELECTION CRITERIA -** | **Points** |
| ***QUALITY OF******PROJECT EVALUATION******PLAN*****(Up to 20 points)** | * Clarity and importance of the key questions to be addressed by a rigorous independent *Project Evaluation* and appropriateness of the method(s) for how each question is addressed.
 | **/5** |
| * Extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well-implemented, produce evidence of the project’s effectiveness.
 | **/5** |
| * Extent to which the proposed *Project Evaluation Plan* and *Project Budget* include sufficient resources to carry out a rigorous independent evaluation effectively.
 | **/10** |
| ***SUB-TOTAL:*** | **/20** |
| ***REVIEWER COMMMENTS***: -***Grant Application’s Strengths:***  ***-Reviewer Suggestions:***   |
| ***OPTIONAL******COMPETITIVE PREFERENCE******PRIORITY*****(Up to 3 points**) | * Type of Matching Funds (*Cash Outlay* and/or *In-Kind Donations*) is briefly described.
 | **/1** |
| * Dollar amount of Matching Funds and percent of total *Project Budget* that they represent is specified.
 | **/1** |
| * Source(s) of all Matching Funds is briefly described, accompanied by a signed and dated *Pledge Letter(s)* providing evidence that at least 50% of Matching Funds have been pledged or secured by the time of *Grant Application.*
 | **/1** |
| ***SUB-TOTAL:*** | **/3** |
| ***REVIEWER COMMENTS***:-***Grant Application’s Strengths:***  ***-Reviewer Suggestions:*** |

|  |
| --- |
| **- TOTAL SCORE SUMMARY -** |
| **SELECTION CRITERIA:** | **Points Scored** |
| **SIGNIFICANCE** *(Up to 35 possible points)* |  |
| **QUALITY OF PROJECT DESIGN AND MANAGEMENT PLAN** *(Up to 45 possible points)* |  |
| **QUALITY OF PROJECT EVALUATION PLAN** *(Up to 20 [possible points)* |  |
| **OPTIONAL COMPETITIVE PREFERENCE PRIORITY\*** *(Up to 3 possible points)* |  |
| ***TOTAL SCORE:*** ***(Up to 100 Total Points / 103\* Total Points with Optional Competitive Preference Priority)*** |  |