


RISE Education Fund

Scoring Rubric for Grant Proposals

The grant proposal scoring rubric will be used to evaluate the grant applications submitted for consideration. Applications will be reviewed by a grant selection committee appointed by Governor Polis. The committee will use this rubric to guide its deliberations.

SCORING DEFINITIONS

- Minimally Addressed or Does Not Meet Criteria - information not provided
- Met Some but Not All Identified Criteria - requires additional clarification
- Addressed Criteria but Did Not Provide Thorough Detail - adequate response, but not thoroughly developed or high-quality response
- Met All Criteria with High Quality - clear, concise, and coherent response

Need:	 /20
Focus:	 /20
Sustainability:	 /15
Evaluation:	 /10
Priority:	 /10
Innovation:	 /25
Total:	 /100

GENERAL COMMENTS: Indicate support for scoring by including overall strengths and weaknesses. These comments will be provided to applicants with their final scores.

RECOMMENDATION:

_____ I am in support of awarding grant funding to this project.

_____ I am in support of awarding grant funding to this project with funding changes to _____.

_____ I am not in support of awarding grant funding to this project.

Applicant:

Date:

Need:	Minimally Addressed or Does Not Meet Criteria	Met Some but Not All Identified Criteria	Addressed Criteria but Did Not Provide Thorough Detail	Met All Criteria with High Quality	TOTAL
1) How well has the applicant clearly identified community, family, educator, and student needs?	0	2	4	6	
2) How well does the applicant’s proposal respond to and propose to meet the needs identified by community members, families, educators, and students?	0	3	5	7	
3) Compared to other populations or communities in Colorado how much has the community or population served by this applicant been significantly impacted by COVID-19?	0	3	5	7	
Reviewer Comments:					
					Total /20

Focus:	Minimally Addressed or Does Not Meet Criteria	Met Some but Not All Identified Criteria	Addressed Criteria but Did Not Provide Thorough Detail	Met All Criteria with High Quality	TOTAL
4) Describe the plan to focus on at least one of the identified focus areas (student-focused learning, rethinking the student experience, strengthening and formalizing linkages, or catalyzing innovations that can drive long-term impact).	0	1	4	6	
5) How well has the applicant identified any evidence that suggests the proposed approach will be effective at improving student learning and addressing equity gaps?	0	1	4	6	
6) How well has the application advanced equity by reaching students most likely to have been affected by the economic and health impacts of the COVID-19 crisis?	0	4	6	8	
Reviewer Comments:					
					Total /20

Sustainability:	Minimally Addressed or Does Not Meet Criteria	Met Some but Not All Identified Criteria	Addressed Criteria but Did Not Provide Thorough Detail	Met All Criteria with High Quality	TOTAL
7) Has the applicant identified a plan to sustain grant activities after the grant period?	0	1	2	4	
8) Has the applicant identified donors (which may be in-kind) or sources of funds that can leverage the state funds and help to ensure the project is sustainable beyond the grant period?	0	1	2	4	
9) To what degree does the proposal have support from community organizations such as local chambers of commerce, non-profits, businesses, or faith-based organizations?	0	1	3	7	
Reviewer Comments:					
					Total /15

Evaluation:	Minimally Addressed or Does Not Meet Criteria	Met Some but Not All Identified Criteria	Addressed Criteria but Did Not Provide Thorough Detail	Met All Criteria with High Quality	TOTAL
10) The applicant provides clearly measurable goals, performance benchmarks, and outcomes.	0	1	3	5	
11) Leaders/partners/collaborators provide a plan to use data to guide decision-making and measure effectiveness formatively and summatively.	0	1	3	5	
Reviewer Comments:					
Total					/10

Priority:	Does Not Meet Criteria			Met All Criteria	TOTAL
12) The applicant serves rural students or communities as defined by at least one partner that is located in a rural area as defined by CDE, or defined by the National Center for Education Statistics as a rural institution (rural fringe, distant or remote) OR The applicant plans to serve students who attend a school or a district with a priority improvement or turnaround plan.	0			5	
13) The applicant’s proposal addresses significant equity gaps between students based on income, race or ethnic group, status as an English learner, or disability status.	0			5	
Reviewer Comments:					
Total					/10

Innovation:	Minimally Addressed or Does Not Meet Criteria	Met Some but Not All Identified Criteria	Addressed Criteria but Did Not Provide Thorough Detail	Met All Criteria with High Quality	TOTAL
14) Overall, how well does the application support innovative, locally driven solutions to respond to the impact of the COVID-19 crisis?	0	4	6	8	
15) Overall, how well does the application address broad structural challenges and overcome barriers to learning that have the potential to be replicated in the future by other school districts and institutions?	0	3	5	9	
16) Overall, to what degree does the application represent a project that will be something fundamentally different from what is already occurring?	0	4	6	8	
Reviewer Comments:					
Total					/25