

Beyond the Books Educational Foundation
“STANDARD” and “BEYOND THE BOX” Grant Application Rubric

| <i>Section 1</i> | 5 points | 4 - 2 points | 1 - 0 point | Score |
|--|---|---|---|--------------|
| Clarity of Proposal | Language is clear and direct in straightforward, grammatically correct sentences. | Some effort is made to avoid overuse of educational jargon and obtuse language. | Proposal has not been carefully proofread, overuses jargon, and/or is generally not clear. | |
| Project Goals and Benefits | Goals are clearly described and thoroughly documented. Proposal clarifies how and to what extent students and/or other educators/classes will benefit. | Project’s purpose is stated and some evidence of need is provided. Potential benefits are stated and some evidence is provided of how objectives will be met. | Project’s purpose is unclear or does not state goals and objectives. | |
| Project Design | Project has a strong, sustainable design. The procedures, timeline and activities are well defined and fully explained. Outcomes are linked to project goals. | Project design is adequate, but somewhat unclear, or outcomes are not clearly linked to project goals. | Project design is vague, timeline is unclear, and outcomes are not clearly linked to project goals. | |
| Research and Relevance | Project identifies research-based strategies and clearly relates those strategies to the project goals. Project is aligned to Common Core State Standards. | Project identifies research-based strategies, but has not drawn clear connections to the project goals. | Research-based strategies are not identified, or are not related to the project goals. | |
| Collaboration and Educational Connections | Proposal includes multiple collaborative partners who each add value to the program (i.e. schools, districts, businesses, and/or other grants). | Proposal includes appropriate collaborative partners (i.e. school-to-school, and/or other grant support). | Proposal includes limited educational connections (i.e. educator-to-educator). | |
| Budget | Budget is complete and contains all required information. Budget is cost efficient and linked to activities and outcomes. | Budget is complete but is not cost efficient or linked to activities and outcomes. | Budget lacks required information. | |
| Project Evaluation | Proposal includes a variety of appropriate methods to assess the response of participants and/or evaluate the effectiveness of the project. | Proposal includes at least one appropriate method to assess the response of participants and/or evaluate the project’s effectiveness. | Proposal does not include methods to assess the response of participants and/or evaluate the project’s effectiveness. | |
| | | | Sub-total (maximum score is 35) | |
| <i>Section 2</i> | | | | |
| “Wow” Factor | The application makes a strong impression through the innovation and impact of the proposal: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It includes creative, original ideas for implementation (with or without technology). • It is designed to maximize students’ enthusiasm for learning. • It is likely to make a long-lasting, positive impression on the learners whether in a single classroom or expanded to include other classrooms, schools, or districts. | | | |
| | | | Sub-total (maximum score is 15) | |
| | | | TOTAL Score | |

These two sections allow for a maximum of 50 points ~ 35 possible for the defined criteria, and 15 for the more intangible, subjective assessment of innovation and potential impact.