Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction
Gifted and Talented Education Grant
Uniform Grant Rubric

The descriptors for each item are below. Reviewers must use the Google Form to record all scores.

III. Abstract

⇨ **Weak (0 points)**: The abstract had a missing or incomplete summary of the target population, the key needs, and/or the planned implementation approach(es).

⇨ **Average (1 point)**: 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 (2 points)**: The abstract summarized the target population, summarized the key needs, and summarized the planned implementation approach(es).

VII. Readiness
1. Stakeholders
1a. Identification of Stakeholders and Stakeholder Roles

⇨ **Not Present (0 points)**: No stakeholders and/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/no stakeholder representation from the target population.

⇨ **Accomplished (3 points):** The stakeholder team and corresponding roles were clearly described. These stakeholders represent students who have been historically and/or are currently marginalized.

⇨ **Exemplary (4 points):** The stakeholder team and corresponding roles were described in-depth. These stakeholders represent students who have been historically and/or are currently marginalized and each was chosen specifically for their expertise in working with/representing these marginalized students.

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 but 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) but 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 their 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.

VIII. 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 but 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, the 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 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, focuses on areas of strength in relation to the area(s) of need, and fits naturally with the outlined need(s).

<u>1c. Priority Area(s) or Statement(s) to address the root cause(s).</u>

⇨ **Not Present (0 points)**: There was no priority area(s) or statement(s) included.

⇨ **Beginning (1 point)**: There was a priority area(s) or statement(s) included, but was not connected to the root cause(s).

⇨ **Developing (2 points)**: There was a priority area(s) or statement(s) included, but was only partially connected to the root cause(s).

⇨ **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 strength, and it fits naturally with the outlined root cause(s).

IX. 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 Area(s)/Statement(s) and SMART Goal(s)**

   ⇨ **Not Present (0 points)**: There was not an action plan for every priority area/statement and/or SMART goal.

   ⇨ **Beginning (1 point):** There was an action plan for each priority area/statement, 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/statement. The goal does not meet all SMART goal requirements, but does address the priority area/statement.

   ⇨ **Accomplished (3 points):** There was an action plan for each priority area/statement. The action plan included a goal that met all SMART goal requirements, and the SMART goal directly addresses the priority area/statement.

   ⇨ **Exemplary (4 points):** There was an action plan for each priority area/statement. The action plan included a goal that met all SMART goal requirements, and the SMART goal directly addressed the priority area/statement and it directly addresses their overall project needs.

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/statement and/or the SMART goal.

   ⇨ **Accomplished (3 points):** The Action Plan's action step(s), timeline, evidence of completion, and personnel responsible was fully addressed. The action step(s) related directly to the priority area/statement and SMART goal.

   ⇨ **Exemplary (4 points):** The Action Plan's action step(s), timeline, evidence of completion, and personnel responsible was thoughtfully addressed and would help achieve the stated goal. The action step(s) tightly align with the priority area/statement and SMART goal.

X. Study/Check
 1. Evaluation
  <u>1a. Process to collect and analyze grant specific data</u>

  ⇨ **Not Present (0 points)**: No process is described for how grant specific data will be collected and/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 who have not traditionally benefited from this type of action.

  ⇨ **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 not traditionally benefited from these types of actions.

  <u>1b. Process for changing or making improvements to action steps</u>

  ⇨ **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 and/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.

  <u>1c. Process for sharing evaluation results with the public</u>

  ⇨ **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.

XI. Act

1. Coordination and Sustainability

<u>1a. Coordination with other programs</u>

⇨ **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.

⇨ **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.

<u>1b. Protocols for ongoing communication</u>

⇨ **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/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/external stakeholders (as applicable) will occur at least quarterly, how the means of communication are clearly defined, and how formal/written communication protocols have been put in place to communicate within and across the system.

<u>2. Sustainability</u>

⇨ **Not Present (0 points)**: There was no description of any procedures and policies that can sustain the grant work after the grant period.

⇨ **Beginning (1 point):** There is an incomplete description of any procedures and policies that can sustain the grant work after the grant period.

⇨ **Developing (2 points):** There was a limited description of any procedures and policies that can sustain the grant work after the grant period.

⇨ **Accomplished (3 points):** There was a clear description of any procedures and policies that can sustain the grant work after the grant period.

⇨ **Exemplary (4 points):** There was an in-depth description about procedures and policies that can sustain the grant work after the grant period.

Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction
Gifted and Talented Education Grant
Uniform Grant Rubric

APPLICATION OVERVIEW		
Applicant's Name	Reviewer's Number	Date of Review *Mo./Day/Yr.*

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. Abstract	0, 1, 2	x 1.0	
VII. Readiness—1a. Identification of Stakeholders/Stakeholder roles	0, 1, 2, 3, 4	x 1.0	
VII. Readiness—1b. Stakeholder Input in Informing Grant Project	0, 1, 2, 3, 4	x 1.0	
VII. Readiness—1c. Stakeholder Input if Grant Project is Funded	0, 1, 2, 3, 4	x 1.0	
VIII. Plan—1a. Demonstration of Need and Supporting Data	0, 1, 2, 3, 4	x 2.0	
VIII. Plan—1b. Root Cause(s)	0, 1, 2, 3, 4	x 1.5	
VIII. Plan—1c. Define Priority Area(s)/Statement(s)	0, 1, 2, 3, 4	x 2.0	
IX. Do—1. Action Plan's Priority Area/Statement and SMART goal	0, 1, 2, 3, 4	x 1.5	
IX. Do—2. Action Plan's Action Steps, Timeline, Evidence of Completion, and Personnel	0, 1, 2, 3, 4	x 1.5	
X. Study/Check—1a. Process used to collect and analyze grant-specific data	0, 1, 2, 3, 4	x 1.0	
X. Study/Check—1b. Process for changing or making improvements to action steps	0, 1, 2, 3, 4	x 1.0	
X. Study/Check—1c. Process for sharing evaluation results with the public	0, 1, 2, 3, 4	x 1.0	
XI. Act—1a. Coordination with other programs	0, 1, 2, 3, 4	x 1.5	
XI. Act—1b. Protocols for ongoing communication	0, 1, 2, 3, 4	x 1.0	

XI. Act—2. Sustainability - Communication structures and protocols	0, 1, 2, 3, 4	x 1.0	
		Overall Score	0
	APPLICATION OVERVIEW		

Reviewer Comments