

Idaho Education Technology Association
Grant Evaluation Rubric – Classroom Technology
2016 – 2017 School Year (Review – December 14, 2016)

Name of Applicant: _____

Name of Proposal: _____

Total Score (max 250)

Required Components

Score (out of 200):

- The application was submitted by an eligible IETA member* (100 points).
- The application was received prior to the application deadline (50 points).
- The application does not exceed the maximum funding amount (50 points).

Project Goals & Objectives/Project Plan

Score (out of 10):

- The proposal is clear—it is fully understood what is proposed and the intent of the request.
- The proposal lists clear, realistic, measurable objectives that **address an educational need**.
- The proposal objectives directly impact students in the classroom.
- The proposal provides a clear description of the project's components (hardware/software/PD/etc.).

Budget

Score (out of 10):

- If hardware/software is proposed: the specified items in the proposed budget are appropriate for the project described.
- The proposal clearly identifies how the items in the budget will be used to further the program goals.
- Appropriate provisions have been made for non-funded, but necessary components.

Impact/Sustainability

Score (out of 10):

- The proposal improves student access to and use of technology.
- The proposal incorporates the use of technology in academic areas.
- The proposed project provides a good value for the investment.
- The proposed project appears to be sustainable for future years.

Evaluation

Score (out of 10):

- The proposed evaluation plan measures the objectives of the project. It answers the question: "How will you measure the project's success?"
- The evaluation plan includes a description of the process for evaluation.
- The evaluation plan is likely to produce reasonably reliable results.

Other Considerations

Extra Credit
(out of 10):

- The proposed project addresses a uniquely demonstrable need in the school/district.
- The proposal leverages additional resources beyond the scope of the project.

Description of Ratings	
Excellent 9 - 10	Specific and comprehensive. Complete, detailed, and clearly articulated information as to how the criteria are met. Well-conceived and thoroughly developed ideas.
Good 5 - 8	General but sufficient detail. Adequate information as to how the criteria are met, but some areas are not fully explained and/or questions remain. Some minor inconsistencies and weaknesses.
Fair 2 – 4	Sketchy and non-specific. Criteria appear to be minimally met, but limited information is provided about approach and strategies. Lacks focus and detail.
Poor 0 - 1	Does not meet the criteria, fails to provide information, provides inaccurate information, or provides information that requires substantial clarification as to how the criteria are met.

Additional considerations may be considered by the grant review team and will be discussed before final awards are made:

- **Although the rubric results in a measurable score, the review team reserves the right to adjust scores or reallocate grants based upon multiple factors including but not limited to:**
 - **Equitable dispersal of grant funds**
 - **Allocation of funds to more than one region (geographic dispersal).**
 - **Avoidance of funding multiple grants in a single school/district.**
 - **Awarding variety in approved proposals**
 - **Allocation of funds to various types of requests rather than awarding grants to extremely similar proposals.**
 - **Awarding creativity and innovation**
 - **Awarding clearly demonstrable need**