

CSP Quality Counts Innovation Grant Rubric

Charter School Name:				
Corporation Number:			Total Points:	

Rubric System based on point system: 1 point = inadequate; 2 points = adequate; 3 points = excellent

Part 1: Grantee Information

Inadequate – 1 point	Adequate – 2 points	Excellent – 3 points	Score	NOTES
Missing two or more areas of information	Missing one area of information	All areas of information complete		

Part 3: Assurances

Inadequate – 1 point	Adequate – 2 points	Excellent – 3 points	Score	NOTES
Missing one or more signatures		All signatures are complete		

Part 5: Comprehensive Needs Assessment

Inadequate – 1 point	Adequate – 2 points	Excellent – 3 points	Score	NOTES
Description of program goals and objectives is incomplete or vague; program goals and objectives do not align to data and prioritized needs.	Description of program goals and objectives is provided; goals and objectives partially align to data sources and prioritized needs.	Description of program goals and objectives is clear; proposed activities clearly align to needs assessment; direct link provided from identified needs to proposed activities.		
Specific data sources missing; little to no quantitative or qualitative data utilized; only one data source included; data does not align to program goals or prioritized needs.	Specific data sources provided; quantitative and/or qualitative data utilized; more than one data source included; data may not clearly align to program goals and prioritized needs.	Specific data sources provided; analysis of quantitative and qualitative data utilized; more than one data source included; data aligns to program goals and prioritized needs.		

Description of prioritized needs is missing; identified needs are not aligned to data sources or program goals and objectives; no description of how high-need schools will be prioritized.	Description of prioritized needs is provided; identified needs are partially aligned to data sources or program goals and objectives; partial description of how high-need schools will be prioritized.	Clear description of prioritized needs is provided; identified needs are clearly aligned to data sources and program goals and objectives; clear description of how high-need schools will be prioritized.		
Little to no evidence of consultation; only staff or internal groups were consulted. No description of consultation activities included.	Evidence of consultation; staff or internal groups and external or community groups were consulted; description of consultation activities included.	Evidence of extensive consultation; multiple staff or internal groups and external or community groups were consulted; clear description of consultation activities included.		

Part 6: CSP Quality Counts Innovation Grant Activities

Inadequate – 1 point	Adequate – 2 points	Excellent – 3 points	Score	NOTES
Descriptions of activities are missing or do not clearly or adequately describe the scope of work of proposed programming.	All description sections are completed; some may lack clarity in describing the scope of work of proposed programming.	All description sections are completed and clearly and adequately describe the scope of work of proposed programming.		
Rationale linking needs assessment and proposed activities is missing or unclear; outcomes of proposed activities do not tie back to identified needs.	Rationale linking needs assessment and proposed activities is somewhat clear; link between outcomes of proposed activities and identified needs.	Rationale linking needs assessment and proposed activities is clear and comprehensive; clear link between outcomes of proposed activities and identified needs.		

Part 7: Internal Capacity Building Plan

Inadequate – 1 point	Adequate – 2 points	Excellent – 3 points	Score	NOTES
-----------------------------	----------------------------	-----------------------------	--------------	--------------

References to specific future funding sources are vague or missing; no clear plan to continue activities provided; little or no evidence of effective capacity building.	Possible future funding sources provided but may lack specificity; plan to continue activities provided; some capacity building is evident or built into the plan.	Future funding sources are specific and may include assurances or evidence of future funding having been secured; clear plan to continue activities in absence of CSP Quality Counts Innovation Grant funds provided; clear focus on local capacity building is evident.		
There is no plan in place to track effectiveness of action steps or the suggested plan does not have a clear measurable outcome.	The plan to track measurable outcomes is unclear.	There is an effective plan in place to track measurable outcomes.		

Part 8: Building Local Capacity

1 point	2 points	3 points	Score	NOTES
Applicant minimally describes artifact or outcome for IDOE submission. Applicant lacks evidence of effective and evidence-based implementation of the CSP Quality Counts Innovation Grant	Applicant partially describes the artifact or outcome for IDOE submission. Applicant is unclear in describing effective and evidence-based implementation of the grant.	Applicant completely describes the submission of their intended artifact to the IDOE. Applicant fully and clearly describes effective and evidence-based implementation of the grant.		

Part 9: Budget

Inadequate – 1 point	Adequate – 2 points	Excellent – 3 points	Score	NOTES
Either budget request table or detailed budget page provided; missing components within tables.		Both budget table AND detailed budget provided and all sections are completed.		

Few or no expenditures are reasonable, allowable, or necessary.	Some expenditures are reasonable, allowable, and necessary.	All expenditures are reasonable, allowable, and necessary.		
Few, if any, expenditures are aligned with the activities and goals of the grant.	Some expenditures are aligned with the activities and goals of the grant.	All expenditures are aligned with the activities and goals of the grant.		
Expenditures are considered supplanting		Expenditures are not considered supplanting		
Narrative boxes are not complete OR gives little detail to how funding will be utilized.	Narrative boxes are mostly complete OR some detail to how funding will be utilized.	Narrative boxes are complete and give great detail to how funding will be utilized.		
Budget tables contain 5 or more errors; budget totals do not align.	Budget tables contain 1-4 errors; most budget totals align.	Budget tables contain no errors; budget totals align.		

Total Points:

(51 points possible)