



PI-000(Bully Prevention)

Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction Bullying Prevention Grant Uniform Grant Rubric

The descriptors for each item are below. Reviewers should use the Rubric Scoring Sheet 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).

VI. 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.

VII. Plan/Needs Assessment

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.

VIII. Do (Action Plan)

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

1. 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.

IX. Study/Check (Evaluation)

1. 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.
- ⇒ **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.

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 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.

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.

X. Act (Coordination & Sustainability)

1. Coordination

1. 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):** There was a limited description of how communications with stakeholders will occur using planned procedures and 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.

2. Sustainability

2a. Coordination with other programs/sustainability

- ⇒ **Not Present (0 points):** There was no description of any possible coordination with federal, state, and local resources to effectively use public funds during the grant period.
- ⇒ **Beginning (1 point):** There was an incomplete description of any possible coordination with federal, state, and local resources to effectively use public funds during the grant period.
- ⇒ **Developing (2 points):** There was a brief description of any possible coordination with federal, state, and local resources to effectively use public funds during the grant period.
- ⇒ **Accomplished (3 points):** There was a clear and strong description of any possible coordination with federal, state, and local resources to effectively use public funds during the grant period.
- ⇒ **Exemplary (4 points):** There was an in-depth description of any possible coordination with federal, state, and local resources to effectively use public funds during the grant period, including an explanation of what effective use of public funds could occur and how that approach would be carried out.



PI-0000 Bully Prevention

Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction Bullying Prevention Grant Rubric Scoring Sheet

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	
VI. Readiness— 1a. Identification of Stakeholders/Stakeholder roles	0, 1, 2, 3, 4	x 1.0	
VII. Plan— 1a. Demonstration of Need and Supporting Data	0, 1, 2, 3, 4	x 1.0	
VIII. Do— Action Plan's Action Steps, Timeline, Evidence of Completion, and Personnel	0, 1, 2, 3, 4	x 1.0	
IX. Study/Check— 1. Process used to collect and analyze grant-specific data	0, 1, 2, 3, 4	x 1.0	
IX. Study/Check— 2. Process for changing or making improvements to action steps	0, 1, 2, 3, 4	x 1.0	
IX. Study/Check— 3. Process for sharing evaluation results with the public	0, 1, 2, 3, 4	x 1.0	
X. Act— 1. Coordination, Protocols for ongoing communication	0, 1, 2, 3, 4	x 1.0	
X. Act— 2. Sustainability, Coordination with other programs/sustainability of the project beyond grant period	0, 1, 2, 3, 4	x 1.0	
Overall Score			

	APPLICATION OVERVIEW	
Reviewer Comments		

Reviewer Comments