



# Grant Application Judging Rubric 2022-23

Please judge the grants based on the following criteria. Read through each section and score based on the scale below. A total of **70 points** is possible for each application.

	7-10 Points / Strong	4-6 Points	0-3 Points / Weak	Score
<b>Grant Idea/ Description (Q1)</b>	Clear, concise, compelling. The description is thorough, and it is easy to gain a clear understanding as to what is being requested. The idea is a compelling idea.	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 and/or the idea isn't compelling.	The description is vague and/or elements of it seem unrealistic. The description seems very sparse and needs lots of additional details. The idea is not at all compelling.	
<b>Rationale for Approach/ Innovation (Q2)</b>	Strong rationale for the approach used. It conveys a new idea that shows significant promise, and/or addresses a specific, compelling need. The potential benefits are clearly conveyed.	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.	Does not demonstrate innovation or a compelling need and/or the benefits to students are not understandable.	
<b>Impact/ Outcomes (Q3)</b>	Clearly articulates the impact 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; results are clearly identified and articulated. Potential for ongoing impact.	Somewhat unclear, or the impact is 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.	Very limited in its impact on students. Does not articulate any enduring or measurable outcome.	
<b>Foundation Recognition (Q4)</b>	Great potential for a highly visible program of interest to the community. Identifies new or original methods for promoting the program and building awareness of the Foundation.	Limited visibility in greater community. Identifies traditional ways to promote, such as classroom newsletters, building emails, Foundation stickers and discussion at curriculum night.	Does not identify how to promote the program and/or create visibility for the Foundation.	



# Grant Application Judging Rubric 2022-23

Please judge the grants based on the following criteria. Read through each section and score based on the scale below. A total of **70 points** is possible for each application.

Note scale change from page 1 metrics

	<b>4-5 Points / Strong</b>	<b>2-3 Points</b>	<b>0-1 Point / Weak</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>Scalability (Q5)</b>	Impact across multiple schools or clear potential for replication with positive outcomes at scale.	Impact in only one school or limited potential for replication.	Limited impact and not scalable.	
<b>Budget</b>	The budget appears complete. The numbers tie with the proposed expenses and tax and shipping are calculated as applicable. Multiple sources of funding to support project.	The budget may contain some minor errors and/or not provide specific details.	The budget appears to be a guess or exceeds the grant limit. There are no other sources of funding.	
<b>Fit with Foundation Priorities</b>	Clearly articulates how the grant will support at least one of the Foundation's areas of focus. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Academic Support &amp; Enrichment</li> <li>• Mental, behavioral &amp; social emotional support</li> <li>• Basic student needs (at school)</li> <li>• Community outreach &amp; inclusivity</li> </ul>	Somewhat unclear in how it supports the Foundation's areas of focus.	Does not appear to support the Foundation's areas of focus	
	<b>10-15 Points / Strong</b>	<b>5-9 Points</b>	<b>0-4 Points / Weak</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>Overall Impression</b>	Extremely compelling. This grant would be a wise investment.	Moderately compelling. The grant should be funded if sufficient funds remain in the budget or if reservations addressed.	Not compelling. May not be a prudent investment of the Foundations funds at this time.	
			<b>Total Score:</b>	