

Please judge the grants based on the following criteria. Read through each section and score based on the scale below. A total of 75 points is possible for each application.

Program Description (Question #1- What do you want to do?)

4-5 points: The description of the program is clear, complete and concise. The description is quite thorough and it is easy to gain a clear understanding as to what is being requested.

2-3 points: The description is unclear and/or uses undefined terms. The description seems to have potential gaps in logic or is missing information. There are significant questions.

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

Rationale for Approach/Innovation (Question #2- Why did you choose this approach and is this an innovative approach to an existing problem?)

7-10 points: The application contains strong rational for the approach used. It 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 clearly articulate the rationale for approach used, and/or is not innovative and/or addresses a specific, compelling need. 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.

Impactful/Enduring Outcomes (Question #3- How will you know if 'worked'?)

7-10 points: The application clearly articulates the impact this grant will have on students, providing complete, understandable and measurable student outcomes. The benefits reach a broad range of students or deeply enhance the learning of a small number of students; these results are clearly identified and articulated. The grant offers a potential ongoing impact.

4-6 points: The application is somewhat unclear or not compelling. There is little evidence that the grant will provide an impact that will remain with the students over time. Results will be hard to articulate and outcomes will be difficult to measure.

1-3 points: The project is very limited in its impact on students. It does not articulate any enduring or measurable outcome.

Supporting the needs of the Whole Child (Question #4- How does your program/activity support the needs of the whole child?)

7-10 points: The application clearly articulates how this grant will support the needs of the whole child- defined as students' comprehensive academic, social/emotional and health needs. A whole child approach: 1) ensures that each student is healthy, safe, engaged, supported, and challenged, and 2) sets the standard for comprehensive, sustainable school improvement and provides for long-term student success.

4-6 points: The application is somewhat unclear or not compelling. There is little evidence that the grant supports the needs of the whole child.

1-3 points: The application does support the needs of the whole child.

Issaquah Schools Foundation Recognition (Question #5- How will people know that the Foundation supported this project?)

7-10 points: The application identifies a great potential for a highly visible program that is something the Foundation can promote in the greater community. It identifies new, innovative or original methods for promoting the program and building awareness of the Foundation.

4-6 points: The application is limited to one classroom or school so would initially have limited visibility in the greater community, but over time has the potential to build into a moderately visible program that the Foundation could promote. The application identifies traditional ways to promote this program, such as classroom newsletters, building emails, ISF stickers and discussion at curriculum night.

1-3 points: The application does not identify how to promote the program and/or create visibility for the Foundation.

Budget

4-5 points: The budget appears complete. The numbers tie with the proposed expenses and tax and shipping are calculated as applicable. There are multiple sources of funding supporting the project. The request to the Foundation is within the grant limit.

2-3 points: The budget may contain some minor errors.

1 point: The budget appears to be a guess or exceeds the grant limit. There are no other sources of funding.

Overall Application Quality

Fit with Foundation Priorities

7-10 points: The application clearly articulates how this grant will support at least one of the three Foundation areas of focus.

- Building Academic Foundations- Programs that meet basic student needs; develop skills, knowledge, attitudes, and/or behaviors needed for academic success; and/or provide material support (i.e. books that allow for differentiation) needed to assure students are ready to learn.
- Exploring Limitless Opportunities- Programs beyond traditional curricula that inspire a deep passion for learning and allow kids to connect with, thrive in and enjoy learning.
- Launching Successfully into the Future- Programs that help prepare kids for life beyond high school through exploring college, trade and careers.

4-6 points: The application is somewhat unclear in how it supports the Foundation's areas of focus.

1-3 points: The application does support the Foundation's areas of focus.

Accuracy

4-5 points: Spelling and grammar are correct, and attention has been paid to details. Details are consistent throughout.

2-3 points: The application has a few minor mistakes or inconsistencies. Grammar may contain some minor errors.

1 point: The application has multiple mistakes with regard to grammar, and/or accuracy.

Overall “Gut” Impression

7-10 points: The application is extremely compelling. My overall impression is that this grant would be a wise investment.

4-6 points: The application is moderately compelling. My overall impression is that this grant should be funded if sufficient funds remain in the budget.

1-3 points: The application is not compelling. I do not feel like this would be a prudent investment of the Foundations funds.