

Title I \$2 Million Grant Program — Scoring Rubric

Rubric – Title I \$2 Million Grant Program				
Proposal Element	Very Strong (3 points)	Strong (2 points)	Adequate (1 point)	Inadequate (0 points)
i. Needs Analysis <p>School describes the process and findings of the needs assessment conducted and the evidence used to select the intervention/program/services to be provided. The description includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> assessment instruments used school personnel involved process for analyzing findings and selecting the intervention/program/services findings on use of materials and interventions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> curriculum pacing and instructional time Amount and types of staff PD, collaboration, and instructional support use of student data, alignment of resources, and staff effectiveness 	<p>The proposal includes a thorough and complete overview of the process used, including specific instruments used, and multiple data elements cited.</p> <p>The proposal identifies a variety of qualified school, parent, and community stakeholders providing a range of perspectives involved in collecting and analyzing school data.</p> <p>The proposal describes a specific and effective process for analyzing assessment findings, including meetings of appropriate school personnel and school advisory groups to review the findings and provide input on the needs analysis.</p> <p>The proposal includes discrete and specific findings that led to the selection of the intervention/program/services.</p>	<p>The proposal includes a general overview of the process used, including specific instruments used, and multiple data elements cited.</p> <p>The proposal identifies school and community stakeholders involved in collecting and analyzing school data, with a description of their level of involvement.</p> <p>The proposal describes a process for analyzing assessment findings, including a basic description of how school personnel and school advisory groups reviewed the findings and provided input.</p> <p>The proposal includes basic findings that led to the selection of the intervention/program/services.</p>	<p>The proposal includes a general overview of the process used, but lacks specificity on instruments used, and multiple data elements cited.</p> <p>The proposal identifies school and community stakeholders involved in collecting and analyzing school data, but includes a limited or lacks a description of their level of involvement.</p> <p>The proposal describes a process for analyzing assessment findings, without a basic description of how school personnel and school advisory groups reviewed the findings and provided input.</p> <p>The proposal includes limited findings that led to the selection of the intervention/program/services.</p>	<p>The proposal includes limited information on the process used, including specific instruments used, and multiple sources cited.</p> <p>The proposal does not identify appropriate school and community stakeholders involved in collecting and analyzing school data.</p> <p>The proposal does not sufficiently describe a process for analyzing assessment findings.</p> <p>The proposal does not include findings that led to the selection of the intervention/program/services.</p>

Rubric – Title I \$2 Million Grant Program				
Proposal Element	Very Strong (3 points)	Strong (2 points)	Adequate (1 point)	Inadequate (0 points)
ii. Selection of Intervention/ Program/Services The rationale for selection of the intervention/program/services is stated clearly and is correlated to the needs analysis for the school. Implementation of new programs or services is not necessarily desirable unless supported by the needs assessment. Continuation or expansion of existing, effective programs or services (based on objective analysis) may be the most appropriate strategy.	<p>The proposal reflects a logical and well-organized process for selecting the intervention/ program/services. The rationale for the selection demonstrates a solid connection between assessment results, findings of current practice, and staff effectiveness.</p> <p>All areas of the needs analysis are discussed and linked coherently to the selected intervention/ program/services, providing clear evidence that the selection is appropriate for the school.</p> <p>The proposal provides specific data from a variety of sources that explicitly support the selection of the intervention/ program/services.</p>	<p>The proposal describes a basic process for selecting the intervention/program/services. The rationale demonstrates a connection between assessment results, findings of current practice, and staff effectiveness.</p> <p>All areas of the needs analysis are discussed and linked to the selected intervention.</p> <p>The proposal provides data points from several sources to support the selection of the intervention/program/services.</p>	<p>The rationale reflects some sense of organization, but omits significant links to the needs analysis.</p> <p>Few of the needs analysis areas are discussed and/or there is little apparent correlation with the selected intervention/ program/services.</p> <p>The rationale is supported by limited data and from few sources with limited specificity.</p>	<p>The rationale lacks a sense of organization and has no clear links to the needs analysis.</p> <p>Few or none of the needs analysis areas are discussed and/or there is no apparent correlation with the selected intervention/program/services.</p> <p>The rationale is supported by minimal data and includes no specificity.</p>
iii. Demonstration of capacity to implement selected Intervention/ Program/Services The school demonstrates its capacity to use grant funds to provide adequate resources and related support in order to implement, fully and effectively, the required activities of the intervention/program/services it has selected.	<p>The school fully describes how it will use grant funding and all other available resources to implement the intervention/ program/services selected. The proposal includes extensive information on the specific use of each resource to support implementation of the planned school improvement activities.</p> <p>The description demonstrates that the school has fully identified the resource needs and appropriately planned how</p>	<p>The school describes how it will use grant funding to implement the intervention/program/ services selected. The proposal includes general information on how resources will be used to support implementation of the planned school improvement activities.</p> <p>The description demonstrates that the school has considered the resource needs in determining how grant funding</p>	<p>The school provides a limited description of how it will use grant funding to implement the intervention/program/services selected. The proposal includes little information on how other resources will be used to support implementation of the planned school improvement activities.</p> <p>The description partially demonstrates that the school has considered its resource needs in determining how grant</p>	<p>The school provides a minimal description of how it will use grant funding to implement the intervention/program/services selected. The proposal includes no information on how other resources will be used to support implementation of the planned school improvement activities.</p> <p>The description does not adequately demonstrate that the school has considered its resource needs in determining</p>

Rubric – Title I \$2 Million Grant Program				
Proposal Element	Very Strong (3 points)	Strong (2 points)	Adequate (1 point)	Inadequate (0 points)
	resources will be used to achieve successful implementation of all activities planned.	and other school resources will be used to address the specific needs and lead to successful implementation.	funding and other school resources will be used to address the specific needs and lead to successful implementation.	how grant funding and other school resources will be used to address the specific needs and lead to successful implementation.
iv. Align other resources with the intervention/program/ services The school identifies all resources that are currently available that will be used to support implementation of the selected intervention/ program/services. The school identifies other federal, state, school, and/or private funding sources that the school will use to support grant implementation.	The school explicitly identifies any other resources planned for use in implementing the selected intervention/program/ services, and fully describes how these resources will support grant implementation. The other resources identified clearly align with the school's needs analysis and logically and appropriately support the implementation plan.	The school identifies other resources planned for use in implementing selected intervention/program/services and describes how these resources will support grant implementation. The other resources identified align with the school's needs analysis and clearly support the implementation plan.	The school identifies other resources planned for use in implementing selected intervention/program/services but does not describe how these resources will support grant implementation. The other resources identified partially align with the school's needs analysis and support the implementation plan.	The school has identified few, if any, resources planned for use in implementing selected school intervention models. The other resources identified minimally align with the school's needs analysis and lack specificity and coherence with the implementation plan.
v. Sustain the intervention/ program/services after the funding ends The school provides a description of how the intervention/program/ services will be sustained after the funding expires.	The school has provided a clear and comprehensive plan for sustaining the selected intervention/program/services following expiration of the grant funding period.	The school has provided a basic plan to sustain the selected intervention/program/services following expiration of the grant funding period.	The school has provided minimal details of a plan to sustain the selected intervention/program/services following expiration of the grant funding period.	The school has not provided a plan to sustain the selected intervention/program/ services following expiration of the grant funding period.

Rubric – Title I \$2 Million Grant Program				
Proposal Element	Very Strong (3 points)	Strong (2 points)	Adequate (1 point)	Inadequate (0 points)
<p>vi. Annual Goals for Student Achievement</p> <p>The school has established annual goals for student achievement using assessments in English language arts (ELA) and/or mathematics that it will use to monitor its intervention/ program/services.</p> <p>Examples may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Making one year’s progress in ELA and mathematics • Reducing the percentage of students who are non-proficient by 10% or more from the prior year • For students who are two or more years below grade level, accelerating their progress at a rate of two years academic growth in one school year • Graduation rate • UC a-g completion rate 	<p>The annual goals for student achievement are measurable, and are based on valid and reliable assessments in ELA and mathematics.</p> <p>The goals are realistic and reflect high expectations for improved student achievement, and are based on the needs of the school.</p> <p>The plan for monitoring the identified goals is clearly described, includes specific timelines and procedures, and identifies the personnel responsible for its implementation.</p>	<p>The annual goals for student achievement are measurable, and are based on assessments in ELA and mathematics.</p> <p>The goals are realistic, project improved student achievement, and are based on the needs of the school.</p> <p>The plan for monitoring the identified goals is described and includes clear implementation procedures.</p>		<p>The annual goals for student achievement are not sufficiently identified.</p> <p>The goals appear limited, project a minimal increase in student achievement, and/or are not based on the needs of the school.</p> <p>The plan for monitoring the identified goals is inadequate or is not provided.</p>
<p>vii. Budget</p> <p>The projected budget is complete.</p>	<p>The projected budget is complete, expenditures are accurately classified by object code, the full term of the grant is covered, and totals are provided.</p>	<p>The projected budget is complete; expenditures are appropriately listed and totals are provided.</p>	<p>The projected budget is complete; but expenditures are not appropriately listed and totals are not provided.</p>	<p>The projected budget is incomplete, expenditures are not accurately classified, and/or totals are not provided.</p>

Rubric – Title I \$2 Million Grant Program				
Proposal Element	Very Strong (3 points)	Strong (2 points)	Adequate (1 point)	Inadequate (0 points)
<p>viii. Consultation with relevant stakeholders</p> <p>The school has described its process for consulting with relevant stakeholders, including parents, regarding the school’s application and solicited their input for the development and implementation of its intervention/program/services.</p> <p>Examples may include parent meetings, School Site Council meetings, English Learner Advisory Committee (ELAC).</p> <p>The school identifies which stakeholder recommendations have been used in the development of its implementation plan, and discusses stakeholder input not accepted, including a rationale for rejecting that input.</p>	<p>The school clearly identifies its process for consulting with relevant stakeholders regarding its application.</p> <p>The school’s description demonstrates comprehensive consultation with relevant stakeholders, including, for example, parent meetings, School Site Council meetings, and English Learner Advisory Committee (ELAC) meetings.</p> <p>The school has provided minutes and agendas of meetings with relevant stakeholders regarding its application that recount the input obtained.</p> <p>The school has identified all significant stakeholder input, identifies input incorporated in its implementation plan, discusses rejected input and provides a rationale for each rejected suggestion.</p>	<p>The school identifies a general process for consulting with relevant stakeholders regarding its application.</p> <p>The school’s description demonstrates consultation with relevant stakeholders regarding its application, including parents and other stakeholders.</p> <p>The school has described meetings with relevant stakeholders regarding its application, including a description of key stakeholder input that was incorporated in the school’s application.</p> <p>The school has identified significant stakeholder input, identifies input incorporated in its plan, and provides a rationale for each rejected suggestion.</p>	<p>The school does not clearly identify its process for consulting with relevant stakeholders regarding its application.</p> <p>The school’s description does not adequately demonstrate consultation with relevant stakeholders regarding the school’s application.</p> <p>The school has not sufficiently described meetings with relevant stakeholders regarding the school’s application.</p> <p>The school has not sufficiently identified significant stakeholder input, noted input incorporated in its plan, or provided a rationale for each rejected suggestion.</p>	<p>The school does not identify its process for consulting with relevant stakeholders regarding its application.</p> <p>The school’s description does not demonstrate consultation with relevant stakeholders regarding the school’s application.</p> <p>The school has not described meetings with relevant stakeholders regarding the school’s application.</p> <p>The school has not identified significant stakeholder input, noted input incorporated in its plan, nor provided a rationale for each rejected suggestion.</p>

Rubric – Title I \$2 Million Grant Program				
Proposal Element	Very Strong (3 points)	Strong (2 points)	Adequate (1 point)	Inadequate (0 points)
ix. Implementation Chart				
The school's Implementation Chart includes actions and activities required to implement all aspects of the selected intervention/program/services.	The actions and activities are clearly stated, reasonable, research-based, and contain all required elements of the selected intervention/program/services, including those that are already being implemented.	The actions and activities are reasonable and contain all required elements of the selected intervention/program/services, including those already being implemented. Activities reflect strategies likely to increase student achievement.	Most actions and activities are reasonable and contain all required elements of the selected intervention model, including those already being implemented. Activities reflect strategies likely to increase student achievement.	The actions and activities are not clearly stated, may be unreasonable, and/or do not contain all required elements of the selected intervention model. Activities reflect strategies unlikely to increase student achievement
The actions and activities listed are aligned with the needs analysis for the school.	The actions and activities listed are realistic and clearly aligned with the needs analysis of the school. The description includes references to specific aspects of the needs analysis.	The actions and activities listed are aligned with the needs analysis of the school.	The actions and activities listed are partially aligned with the needs analysis of the school.	The actions and activities listed are unrealistic and/or are not clearly aligned with the needs analysis of the school.
The costs of actions and activities listed are identified in the Budget column	The costs of actions and activities listed are identified clearly and realistically based on current costs and financial practices.	The costs of actions and activities listed are identified and are generally aligned with current LEA costs and financial practices.	The costs of actions and activities listed are identified and are poorly aligned with current costs and financial practices.	The costs of actions and activities listed are not fully identified and/or do not appear to be generally aligned with current costs and financial practices.
A timeline of implementation is provided.	The timeline is detailed, clear, contains specific dates, and the pacing appears to be brisk but reasonable.	The timeline is clear and the pacing appears to be appropriate.	The timeline lacks clarity and the pacing may not be appropriate.	The timeline is not clear, does not contain specific dates, and/or the pacing appears unreasonable
The individual(s) who will be responsible for oversight and monitoring are indicated.	The individual(s) responsible for oversight are clearly indicated. The distribution of responsibility is reasonable and realistic.	The individual(s) responsible for oversight are indicated.	Most individual(s) responsible for oversight are indicated.	The individual(s) responsible for oversight are not clearly indicated.