



# Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction

## Perkins NTO Grant

### Uniform Grant Rubric

PI-1320

---

#### III. Abstract

- ⇒ **Weak (0-1 points):** The abstract had an incomplete summary. Aspects of the target population, key needs and/or focus of implementation are missing.
- ⇒ **Average (2-3 points):** The abstract included most of the necessary information but there was still missing information in one of the following: the target population, summarized key needs, or summarized planned implementation approach(es).
- ⇒ **Strong (4 points):** The abstract summarized the target population, the key needs, and the planned implementation approach(es).

#### VI. Readiness

##### 1. Stakeholders

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

- ⇒ **Not Present (0 points):** Stakeholders and stakeholder roles were not identified.
- ⇒ **Weak (1 point):** The stakeholders or stakeholder roles were not adequately described.
- ⇒ **Developing (2 points):** The stakeholders and stakeholder roles were described, but there appeared to be little to no stakeholder representation from the target population.
- ⇒ **Accomplished (3 points):** The stakeholders and corresponding roles were clearly described, including target population stakeholders.
- ⇒ **Exemplary (4 points):** The planned stakeholder team and corresponding roles were described in-depth.

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

- ⇒ **Not Present (0 points):** No stakeholder engagement occurred to inform the proposed grant project.
- ⇒ **Weak (1 point):** Stakeholder engagement was noted but few details were provided.
- ⇒ **Developing (2 points):** Stakeholder engagement was described in a limited way but how this engagement informed the project was not clear.
- ⇒ **Accomplished (3 points):** Stakeholder engagement described 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.

#### VII. Plan

##### 1. Demonstration of Need

###### 1a. Identify overall specific need(s) and corresponding supporting data

- ⇒ **Not Present (0 points):** There was no overall need/gap, supporting data, or a data analysis approach included.

- ⇒ **Weak (1 point):** There was a limited description of the overall need, but no corresponding or 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 for the grant described which was supported by data.
- ⇒ **Exemplary (4 points):** There was a strong description of the overall need, the applicable supporting data, and the 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) identified.
- ⇒ **Weak (1 point):** The root cause(s) was identified in a limited way, but it was not connected to the outlined need(s).
- ⇒ **Developing (2 points):** The likely root cause(s) was identified, but it was only partially aligned to the outlined need(s).
- ⇒ **Accomplished (3 points):** The likely root cause(s) was clearly identified, and it fits naturally with the outlined need(s).
- ⇒ **Exemplary (4 points):** The likely root cause(s) was clearly identified, and articulated through the need(s), that when met will lead to change.

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

- ⇒ **Not Present (0 points):** There was no priority area(s) or statement(s) or approach to address the root cause or need as described.
- ⇒ **Weak (1 point):** There was a priority area(s) or statement(s) included, but was not connected to the root cause(s) or need.
- ⇒ **Developing (2 points):** There was a priority area(s) or statement(s) included, but was only partially connected to the root cause(s) or need.
- ⇒ **Accomplished (3 points):** The priority area(s) or statement(s) was included in detail, and it fits naturally with the outlined root cause(s).
- ⇒ **Exemplary (4 points):** The priority area(s) or statement(s) was clearly identified, focuses on areas of need, and it fits naturally with the outlined root cause(s).

## VIII. 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 Priority Statement with SMART Goal

- ⇒ **Not Present (0 points):** There was not a SMART goal with complete action plan for each Priority Statement.
- ⇒ **Weak (1 point):** There was an action plan for each priority statement, but the goal does not meet all SMART goal requirements.
- ⇒ **Developing (2 points):** There was an action plan for each priority statement, but the SMART goal does not directly address the priority statement.
- ⇒ **Strong (3 points):** There was an action plan for each priority statement. The action plan included a goal that met all SMART goal requirements, and the SMART goal minimally addresses the priority statement.
- ⇒ **Exemplary (4 points):** There was an action plan for each priority statement. Each action plan included a goal that met all SMART goal requirements, and the SMART goal directly addressed the priority statement.

## 2. Action Plan's Action Steps, Timeline, Evidence of Completion and Personnel

- ⇒ **Not Present (0 points):** There was significant information missing from the action plan(s); the action step, timeline, evidence, and/or personnel sections.
- ⇒ **Weak (1 point):** The Action Plan action steps, timeline, evidence of completion, and personnel responsible was vague or partially complete.
- ⇒ **Developing (2 points):** The Action Plan action steps, timeline, evidence of completion, and personnel responsible was included, but was not well-aligned to the priority statement or the SMART goal.
- ⇒ **Strong (3 points):** The Action Plan action steps, timeline, evidence of completion, and personnel responsible was complete and clearly corresponded/aligned to the priority statement or the SMART goal.
- ⇒ **Exemplary (4 points):** The Action Plan action steps tightly align with the priority statement and SMART goal. The action steps, timeline, evidence of completion, and personnel responsible was thoughtfully addressed and would likely help achieve the stated goal.

## IX. 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 and/or analyzed.
- ⇒ **Weak (1 point):** There was a reference to collecting data, but what data, and how it would be collected or analyzed, was unclear.
- ⇒ **Developing (2 points):** There was a description of the process for collecting grant specific data or the data analysis process was outlined, 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 then be analyzed. These data clearly focus on the target population (NTO).
- ⇒ **Exemplary (4 points):** There was a description of both what and how data will be collected, as well as how analysis would occur. There is a clear connection between how data will be used in order to refine, improve, and strengthen the project. The data gathered is analyzed using a protocol in relation to NTO students.

## X. Act

### 1. Coordination

#### 1a. Alignment with existing initiatives or programs

- ⇒ **Not Present (0 points):** No clear plans to coordinate with existing initiatives or programs.
- ⇒ **Weak (1 point):** There was a coordination plan, but the connection to priority statement(s) is unclear.
- ⇒ **Developing (2 points):** There was a coordination plan with existing initiatives or programs that loosely aligned to priority statement(s).
- ⇒ **Accomplished (3 points):** There was a coordination plan with existing initiatives or programs that clearly aligned to priority statement(s), but unclear how it will continue beyond grant period.
- ⇒ **Exemplary (4 points):** There was a coordination plan with existing initiatives or programs that clearly aligned to priority statement(s) that will sustain the grant beyond the grant period.

### 1b. Ongoing communication with stakeholders

- ⇒ **Not Present (0 points):** No planned communication with stakeholders provided.
- ⇒ **Weak (1 point):** Protocols for communication are not ongoing and do not involve both internal or external stakeholders.
- ⇒ **Developing (2 points):** There was a description protocols for ongoing communication with either internal or external stakeholders, but not both.
- ⇒ **Accomplished (3 points):** There was a description for ongoing communication with both internal and external stakeholders during the project.
- ⇒ **Exemplary (4 points):** There was a description for ongoing communication with both internal and external stakeholders during and following the project.

## 2. Sustainability

### a. How will grant project be coordinated with other federal, state, and local resources

- ⇒ **Not Present (0 points):** No clear coordination with other federal, state, or local resources in order to leverage funds for the most effective use of resources for the project.
- ⇒ **Weak (1 point):** There was a reference to coordinating with other funding, but no clear plan.
- ⇒ **Developing (2 points):** There was a description of other targeted resources that could be used to assist the project.
- ⇒ **Accomplished (3 points):** There was a description of resources that will be used to assist the project in the current year.
- ⇒ **Exemplary (4 points):** There was a description of resources that will be used to assist the project in the current year and beyond.