GIPSF Classroom Grant Rubric: Grant Title and Description

	1 Point	2 Points	3 Points
Has the applicant clearly followed application directions?	A vague attempt has been made at following application directions.	Applicant has briefly provided information. Lacks specific details.	Applicant has clearly followed application directions.
Has the applicant clearly described the project?	Scant description provided. Much information is missing.	Applicant has briefly described the project. Lacks specific details.	The applicant has clearly described the project.

	1 Point	3 Points	5 Points
Does the project provide a learning experience that students wouldn't receive?	This project does not provide a new experience. This project's objectives are already met in the community or schools	Adding this project will enhance an existing program or activity. This project's objectives are partially met by the community or schools.	This project provides experiences and opportunities that students cannot currently access at schools. This project's objectives are not currently being met in the schools.
Is the project high impact, involving many students, or one that can be duplicated across the district?	This project involves only a few students This project involves a small number of teachers This project would be difficult to duplicate or expand	This project involves some students (perhaps just one class) This project involves only a select number of teachers, grades, and/or buildings This project could be duplicated by many teachers, grades, and/or buildings with some challenges	This project involves many students This project involves many teachers, grades, and/or buildings (or has the potential to) This project could be duplicated by many teachers, grades, and/or buildings with relative ease.
Does the applicant explain how the project enhances current curriculum?	Explanation is lacking Connections are weak between current curriculum and project Reader has difficulty seeing how the curriculum would be enhanced	Explanation is missing elements Connections could be made between current curriculum and project, but they are not strong Reader can see how the curriculum might be enhanced	Explanation is thorough and compelling Clear connections are made between the current curriculum and the project Reader can easily see how curriculum will be enhanced
Does the applicant explain how the project meets district objectives?	Explanation is lacking Connections are weak between district objectives and project Reader has difficulty seeing how the project advances district goals	Explanation is missing elements Connections could be made between district objectives and project, but they are not strong Reader can see how work toward district goals might be helped	Explanation is thorough and compelling Clear connections are made between district objectives and the project Reader can easily see how the project advances work toward district goals
How many disciplines are used in the project? Does the applicant describe how the project will impact the different disciplines?	One or less disciplines are used in the project	One or only a few disciplines are used in the project Discipline(s) is (are) not clearly or accurately connected to the goals of the project	Many disciplines are used in the project Each discipline is clearly and accurately connected to the goals of the project
Does the project sound like an engaging learning experience? Would you or your children react favorably to the project?	The project might be engaging for a few students The project would not create a positive reaction from me and/or my children	The project might be engaging for some students The project might create a positive reaction from me and/or my children	The project would be highly engaging for a variety of students The project would inspire an excited reaction from me and/or my children

Total Score:		/15	
--------------	--	-----	--

	1 Point	3 Points	5 Points
Does the applicant explain the outcomes?	Vague details have been provided concerning outcomes.	Some information has been provided concerning the outcomes.	Applicant provides detailed information concerning outcomes.
Does the applicant have a plan to measure the outcomes?	A vague attempt has been made to measure outcomes.	A brief plan is provided. Needs specific details.	A plan for measuring outcomes is clear, reasonable.
Are the outcomes realistic?	A brief, non-detailed attempt was made for providing realistic outcomes.	A brief attempt at providing realistic outcomes.	Outcomes are clear, realistic, and attainable.

Total Score:		/15
--------------	--	-----

	1 Point	3 Points	5 Points
Has the applicant provided an itemized budget as requested?	This budget provides few, if any, itemized details.	This project does include budget details.	This project provides adequate, detailed budget information.
Are the expenses reasonable?	Not enough information has been provided.	Some information is provided; some items are questionable as to being reasonable and/or necessary.	The applicant has provided ample, complete information to assure expenses are reasonable and/or necessary.
Is there an expense that is not in line with the Foundation priority of providing additional opportunities for our students?	This application lacks detail concerning any/all expenses. Too vague.	Some (or one of the) expenses are questionable. More detail needed to support request.	All expenses are in line with the Foundation priority of providing additional opportunities for our students.

	1 Point	2 Points	3 Points
Is the timeline reasonable?	Timeline is brief, vague.	Timeline is reasonable.	The applicant has provided adequate, sufficient information concerning the timeline.
Has the applicant planned adequate introduction and follow-up for the project?	Very brief introduction and follow-up are present. Sufficient information not provided.	The applicant has provided introduction and follow-up.	The applicant has provided adequate introduction and follow-up for the project.