



**Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction  
ESSER III Summer Program Grant  
Uniform Grant Rubric**

The descriptors for each item are below. Reviewers should use the Rubric Scoring Sheet to record all scores.

### III. Project Narrative

- ⇒ **Weak (0 points):** The project narrative included two or less of the following required six elements: the scope of the project, target population(s), the key needs, the planned implementation approach(es), and the number of sites and number of students the project expects to serve.
- ⇒ **Average (1 point):** The project narrative included three to four of the following required six elements: the scope of the project, the target population(s), summarized key needs, or summarized planned implementation approach(es), number of sites and number of students expected the project expects to serve.
- ⇒ **Strong (2 points):** The project narrative included all necessary information: the scope of the project, the target population(s), summary of the key needs, and the planned implementation approach(es) and the number of sites and number of students the project expects to serve.

### VIII. Readiness

#### 1. Stakeholders

##### 1a. Identification of Stakeholders and Stakeholder Roles

- ⇒ **Not Present (0 points):** No stakeholders or stakeholder roles were identified.
  - ⇒ **Beginning (1 point):** The stakeholders or stakeholder roles were not adequately described.
  - ⇒ **Developing (2 points):** The stakeholder team and stakeholder roles were described, but there appeared to be little or no stakeholder representation from the target population. If LEA is working with a community partner, that community partner was not identified OR If LEA is working with a community partner, no letter of commitment from community partner was submitted.
  - ⇒ **Accomplished (3 points):** The stakeholder team and corresponding roles were clearly described. These stakeholders represent students who have been significantly impacted by COVID-19 and have been historically or are currently marginalized. If LEA is working with a community partner, that community partner was identified OR If LEA is working with a community partner, a letter of commitment from community partner was submitted.
-

- 
- ⇒ **Exemplary (4 points):** The stakeholder team and corresponding roles were described in-depth. These stakeholders represent students who have been significantly impacted by COVID-19 and have been historically or are currently marginalized. Each was chosen specifically for their expertise in working with these students. If LEA is working with a community partner, that community partner was identified AND a letter of commitment from community partner was submitted.

#### 1b. Stakeholder Input on Proposed Grant Project

- ⇒ **Not Present (0 points):** No stakeholder engagement has occurred to inform the proposed grant project.
- ⇒ **Beginning (1 point):** Stakeholder engagement was noted but few details were provided.
- ⇒ **Developing (2 points):** Stakeholder engagement was described in a limited way. How this engagement informed the project was not clear.
- ⇒ **Accomplished (3 points):** Stakeholder engagement occurred, and the description highlighted how the stakeholder input was used to inform the grant project.
- ⇒ **Exemplary (4 points):** There was an in-depth description of stakeholder engagement, including a description of the stakeholder engagement process(es), which ultimately elicited detailed input that informed the proposed grant project.

#### 1c. Stakeholder Input if Grant Project is Funded

- ⇒ **Not Present (0 points):** No plan for future stakeholder engagement was provided through which regular feedback to inform the ongoing project can occur.
- ⇒ **Beginning (1 point):** Future stakeholder engagement was described but few details were provided.
- ⇒ **Developing (2 points):** Future stakeholder engagement was described in a limited way (e.g., no defined meeting schedule). How this engagement would be used to inform the project was not clear.
- ⇒ **Accomplished (3 points):** Future stakeholder engagement is planned, and the description also highlighted how input would be used to inform the grant project. Regular (e.g., quarterly) meetings are planned with specific meeting topics that have been identified for continuous improvement of the project.
- ⇒ **Exemplary (4 points):** There was an in-depth description of future stakeholder engagement that clearly addressed how the stakeholder engagement elicited detailed input that informed the proposed grant project. Ongoing (e.g., monthly) meetings are planned and specific meeting topics and meeting protocols have been identified for continuous improvement of the project.

---

## IX. Plan

### 1. Demonstration of Need

#### 1a. Identify overall need and corresponding supporting data

- ⇒ **Not Present (0 points):** There was no overall need or supporting data included.
- ⇒ **Beginning (1 point):** There was a limited description of the overall need included. No corresponding supporting data.
- ⇒ **Developing (2 points):** There was a limited description of the overall need for the grant included, as well as a limited amount of supporting data.
- ⇒ **Accomplished (3 points):** There was a clear need described for the grant and applicable supporting data was included.
- ⇒ **Exemplary (4 points):** There was a strong description of the overall need, multiple and varied applicable supporting data, and the organized and systematic approach to use the data for meaningful analysis.

#### 1b. Likely root cause(s) contributing to the need(s) to be addressed

- ⇒ **Not Present (0 points):** There was no root cause(s) listed.
- ⇒ **Beginning (1 point):** The likely root cause(s) was identified in a limited way, but not connected to the outlined need(s).
- ⇒ **Developing (2 points):** The likely root cause(s) was identified, and only partially aligned to the outlined need(s).
- ⇒ **Accomplished (3 points):** The likely root cause(s) was clearly identified and fits naturally with the outlined need(s).
- ⇒ **Exemplary (4 points):** The likely root cause(s) was clearly identified, includes disproportionate impacts of the pandemic on the target population, and fits naturally with the outlined need(s).

#### 1c. Priority Area(s) to address the root cause(s).

- ⇒ **Not Present (0 points):** No priority area(s) or statement(s) included.
- ⇒ **Beginning (1 point):** A priority area(s) was included but not connected to the needs assessment and root cause(s).
- ⇒ **Developing (2 points):** A priority area(s) was included, but only partially connected to the needs assessment and root cause(s).
- ⇒ **Accomplished (3 points):** Priority area(s) included. All identified priorities fit naturally with the needs assessment and outlined root cause(s). Priority areas include both academic AND social, emotional, and mental health.
- ⇒ **Exemplary (4 points):** Priority area(s) included in detail. All identified priorities fit naturally with the needs assessment. Outlined root cause(s) and priority areas include both academic AND social, emotional, and mental health.

---

## X. Do (Action Plan)

Note to reviewers... If there are multiple action plans, be sure to “read across” each action plan before scoring the two sections below.

### 1. Action Plan’s Priority Areas and Specific, Measurable, Appropriate, Realistic, Time specific (SMART)Goal(s)

- ⇒ **Not Present (0 points):** There was not an action plan for every priority area/statement or SMART goal.
- ⇒ **Beginning (1 point):** There was an action plan for each priority area, but the goal does not meet all SMART goal requirements. Or it is a SMART goal that does not directly address the priority area/statement.
- ⇒ **Developing (2 points):** There was an action plan for each priority area. The goal does not meet all SMART goal requirements but does address the priority area/statement.
- ⇒ **Accomplished (3 points):** The action plan included goals for both academics and social and emotional wellness that met all SMART goal requirements. The SMART goals **generally** address each of the priority areas identified. The Evidence-based Out of School Framework elements for each SMART Goal and accompanying action steps is identified.
- ⇒ **Exemplary (4 points):** The action plan included goals for both academics and social and emotional wellness that met all SMART goal requirements. The SMART goals **directly** address each of the priority areas identified. The Evidence-based Out of School Framework elements for each SMART Goal and accompanying action steps is identified.

### 2. Action Plan’s Action Step, Timeline, Evidence of Completion, and Personnel

- ⇒ **Not Present (0 points):** There was significant information missing in the action step, timeline, evidence, and/or personnel sections.
- ⇒ **Beginning (1 point):** The Action Plan’s action step(s), timeline, evidence of completion, and/or personnel responsible was partially incomplete.
- ⇒ **Developing (2 points):** The Action Plan’s action step(s), timeline, evidence of completion, and personnel responsible was included, but was not well-aligned to the priority area and/or the SMART goal.
- ⇒ **Accomplished (3 points):** The Action Plan’s action step(s), timeline, evidence of completion, and personnel responsible was included and **aligns directly** to the priority areas and SMART goal. Action steps included Evidence-Based Improvement Strategies (EBIS) programs and practices.
- ⇒ **Exemplary (4 points):** The Action Plan’s action step(s), timeline, evidence of completion, and personnel responsible was addressed in detail and would help achieve the stated goal. The action step(s) **tightly align** with the priority areas and SMART goal and include EBIS programs and practices.

---

### 3. Equitable Access to ESSER III summer program

⇒ **Not Present (0 point):** The applicant does not identify the barriers that exist in their community and does not identify how it plans to ensure that equitable access to and participation in the summer program occurs.

**Beginning (1 point):** The applicant discusses general barriers that may prevent students and families from participating in ESSER III funded summer programming, but the barriers are not specific to the applicant's community and no well-formed plan to address the barriers is provided.

**Developing (2 points):** The applicant identifies barriers to summer program participation and provides a plan to address the barriers, however the barriers and plan are general and not well aligned.

**Accomplished (3 points):** The applicant identifies general barriers that exist that may prevent students and families from participating in ESSER III funded summer programs and provides a **general plan** for addressing those barriers.

**Exemplary (4 points):** The applicant identifies specific barriers that exist that may prevent students and families from participating in ESSER III summer programs and provides a **detailed plan** for addressing those barriers. The **target population(s) is specifically identified** in the plan developed to address barriers.

## XI. Study/Check

### 1. Evaluation

#### 1a. Process to collect and analyze grant specific data

⇒ **Not Present (0 points):** No process is described for how grant specific data will be collected or analyzed.

⇒ **Beginning (1 point):** There was a reference to collecting data, but what data, and how it would be analyzed, was unclear.

⇒ **Developing (2 points):** There was a description of the process for collecting grant specific data or the data analysis process, but not both.

⇒ **Accomplished (3 points):** There was a description of both what and how data will be collected as well as how these data would be analyzed. These data focus, at least partially, on students identified most in need of summer program supports.

⇒ **Exemplary (4 points):** There was a description of both what and how data will be collected, as well as how a protocol will be used to analyze these data. It is clear that these data will be used in order to refine, improve, and strengthen the project. The data gathered is analyzed using a protocol in relation to students who have been identified as most in need of summer program supports.

---

1b. Process for changing or making improvements to action steps

- ⇒ **Not Present (0 points):** No process is in place for changing or making improvements to the action step(s).
- ⇒ **Beginning (1 point):** There was an incomplete description of the process for changing or making improvements to the action step(s).
- ⇒ **Developing (2 points):** There is a brief description of the process for how changes or improvements to the action step(s) would occur.
- ⇒ **Accomplished (3 points):** There was a strong description, including a review of their data, for how any changes or improvements to the action step(s) would occur.
- ⇒ **Exemplary (4 points):** There was a well-crafted plan that thoroughly uses data to determine when and how any changes or improvements to the action step(s) would occur.

1c. Process for sharing evaluation results with the public

- ⇒ **Not Present (0 point):** No process is in place to share evaluation results with the public.
- ⇒ **Beginning (1 point):** There was a limited description of the process for sharing evaluation results.
- ⇒ **Developing (2 points):** There is a brief description about the process for how evaluation data would be shared with the public.
- ⇒ **Accomplished (3 points):** There was a strong description for how evaluation data would be shared with the public, with a special focus on communicating with specific external stakeholders.
- ⇒ **Exemplary (4 points):** There was a well-crafted plan explaining how, as well as how often, evaluation data would be shared with the public, with a special focus on communicating to specific internal and external stakeholders.

XII.Act

**1. Coordination**

1a. Coordination with other programs

- ⇒ **Not Present (0 points):** There was no description of any possible coordination with existing or available programs or initiatives supported by local, state, or federal funds.
- ⇒ **Beginning (1 point):** There is an incomplete description about coordination with existing or available programs or initiatives supported by local, state, or federal funds.
- ⇒ **Developing (2 points):** There was a brief description about the effective use of these grant funds in relation to existing or available programs or initiatives supported by local, state, or federal funds in order to address the priorities defined in the Action Plan.

- 
- ⇒ **Accomplished (3 points):** There was a **clear description** about the effective use of these grant funds in relation to existing or available programs or initiatives supported by local, state, or federal funds in order to address the priorities defined in the Action Plan. **Coordination between the summer program and other programs or initiatives was addressed with little to no detail.**
  - ⇒ **Exemplary (4 points):** There was an **in-depth description** about the effective use of these grant funds in relation to existing or available programs or initiatives supported by local, state, or federal funds, including an analysis of how these initiatives could support one another to best address the priorities outlined in the Action Plan. **A detailed plan was shared for the coordination between summer programming and other programs or initiatives.**

1b. Protocols for ongoing communication

- ⇒ **Not Present (0 points):** There are no planned procedures or protocols for ongoing communication.
- ⇒ **Beginning (1 point):** There are some planned procedures or protocols for ongoing communication, but they were not adequately described.
- ⇒ **Developing (2 points):** Plan describes how communications with stakeholders will occur using formal protocols.
- ⇒ **Accomplished (3 points):** Plan describes how communications with internal and external stakeholders (as applicable) would occur regularly, how the means of communication are clearly defined, and how formal communication protocols exist.
- ⇒ **Exemplary (4 points):** Plan includes an in-depth description for how communications with internal and external stakeholders (as applicable) will occur at least quarterly, how the means of communication are clearly defined, and how formal or written communication protocols have been put in place to communicate within and across the system.

XII. Budget Narrative

Use of grant funds

- ⇒ **Not Present (0 points):** There was no information submitted.
- ⇒ **Beginning (1 point):** There was a brief description of the plan, but it provided almost no information about how funds will be used.
- ⇒ **Developing (2 points):** Narrative answers were submitted, but description was not complete to determine how all funds will support students, or whether there are unallowable uses as outlined in UGG (2 CFR 200, Subpart E).
- ⇒ **Accomplished (3 points):** Description included how all funds will be used to support students, especially the target population(s) identified, how all are allowable uses for these funds per USS (2 CFR 200, Subpart E), and how the

---

funds **generally align** with needs presented in the needs assessment, the priority areas identified and the Action Plan.

- ⇒ **Exemplary (4 points):** Narrative included an **in-depth description** of how all funds will be used to support the target population(s) identified. **Narrative included the number of sites to be supported and the number of students** expected to participate. Spending is aligned to the needs presented, priority areas identified, the Action Plan, and the scope of work proposed. Proposed spending is reasonable and necessary to implement the project and uses are allowable per UGG (2 CFR 200, Subpart E).





**Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction  
ESSER III Summer Program Grant  
Rubric Scoring Sheet**

00604-R

**APPLICATION OVERVIEW**

Applicant's Name	Reviewer's Number	Date of Review <i>Mo./Day/Yr.</i>
------------------	-------------------	--------------------------------------

**Description**

The table below will be used to calculate the final overall score of the application. This is the score that the DPI will use to determine which projects to fund.

Section Name	Potential Scores	Weighting	Weighted Score
III. Project Narrative	0, 1, 2	x 1.0	
VIII. Readiness— 1a. Identification of Stakeholders/Stakeholder roles	0, 1, 2, 3, 4	x 1.0	
VIII. Readiness— 1b. Stakeholder Input in Informing Grant Project	0, 1, 2, 3, 4	x 1.0	
VIII. Readiness— 1c. Stakeholder Input if Grant Project is Funded	0, 1, 2, 3, 4	x 1.0	
IX. Plan— 1a. Demonstration of Need and Supporting Data	0, 1, 2, 3, 4	x 1.0	
IX. Plan— 1b. Root Cause(s)	0, 1, 2, 3, 4	x 1.0	
IX. Plan— 1c. Define Priority Area(s)	0, 1, 2, 3, 4	x 1.0	

X. Do—1. Action Plan’s Priority Area/Statement and SMART goal	0, 1, 2, 3, 4	x 2.0	
X. Do—2. Action Plan’s Action Steps, Timeline, Evidence of Completion, and Personnel	0, 1, 2, 3, 4	x 2.0	
X. Do—3. Barriers to participation and plan to address barriers	0, 1, 2, 3, 4	X 2.0	
XI. Study/Check—1a. Process used to collect and analyze grant-specific data	0, 1, 2, 3, 4	x 1.0	
XI. Study/Check—1b. Process for changing or making improvements to action steps	0, 1, 2, 3, 4	x 1.0	
XI. Study/Check—1c. Process for sharing evaluation results with the public	0, 1, 2, 3, 4	x 1.0	
XII. Act—1a. Coordination with other programs	0, 1, 2, 3, 4	x 1.0	
XII. Act—1b. Protocols for ongoing communication	0, 1, 2, 3, 4	x 1.0	
XIII. Budget Narrative	0, 1, 2, 3, 4	x 1.0	
<b>Overall Score</b>			0
	<b>APPLICATION OVERVIEW</b>		
Reviewer Comments			