

**Tuscaloosa Education Foundation
Rubric for Grant Submission**

	3 Strong	2 Satisfactory	1 Developing	0 Not Addressed	Score
Project Need	Proposal clearly identifies the project's need and targeted population. Presents rationale and significance of proposed project in the form of a well-structured, logical proposal.	Shows some effort to present the rationale and significance of proposed project in the form of a well-structured proposal.	Rationale and significance of proposed work is not clearly stated.	Project need was not addressed.	
Project Goals	Goals for the project are clearly described and thoroughly documented; proposal supports the TEF goals and objectives.	Project's purpose is stated, and some evidence of need is provided. The proposal aligns with the TEF goals and objectives.	Project's purpose is unclear or does not address stated TEF goals and objectives.	The Project goals were not indicated.	
Project Description	Strong and innovative project design with procedures and activities that are well defined, fully explained, and link to project goals.	Adequate project design with procedures and activities that are defined but project is somewhat unclear. Not clearly linked to project goals or lacks innovation.	Project design is vague and not clearly linked to project goals or innovative.	No description of procedural steps was submitted.	
Budget Itemized & Totaled Budget Other Funding Sources (If Applicable)	Budget is complete, itemized, totaled, and contains all required information. Budget is cost effective and linked to	Budget is complete but is not cost efficient and/or related to activities and outcomes.	Budget lacks required information or includes unallowable expenditures.	Budget was not submitted.	

	activities and outcomes.				
Timeline (Indicate sequence of events)	The project can be completed within the grant year's timeline.	It will be challenging to complete the project within the grant year's timeline without additional help, expertise in assessment, or funds.	It is unlikely that the project can be completed within the grant year's timeline.	The project timeline was not indicated.	
Project Evaluation Evaluation Tool Participant Assessment Reporting	Proposal includes a variety of methods (3 or more) to assess participants and evaluate the project's outcomes.	Proposal includes at least two methods to assess participants or evaluate the project's outcomes.	Proposal includes at least one method to assess participants or evaluate the project's outcomes.	Proposal does not include any methods to assess participants or evaluate the project's outcomes.	
Model of Fiscal Responsibility	Applicant clearly identifies a process for reporting expenditures and results to TEF.	Applicant shows some effort towards a process for reporting expenditures and results to TEF.	Applicant does not clearly indicate a process for reporting expenditures and results to TEF.	Applicant does not indicate a process for reporting expenditures and results to TEF.	
Collaboration (BONUS POINTS)	Proposal includes a well-defined plan identifying appropriate collaborative partners such as community or within the school/system, each of which add	Proposal shows some indication of appropriate collaborative partners.	Critical project partner is missing from the project plans or at least one collaborative partner's contribution to		

	value to the program		the project is unclear.		
Total Points					

- Recommended for full funding
- Should be funded in accordance with available resources
- Proposal incomplete or ineligible for TEF funding

Reviewer Comments:

SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION

___ Recommendation for funding: Based on the above elements together, the project is likely to achieve its stated goals for promoting best practices in assessment within the grant period.

___ Consider this proposal: Some elements were rated “Strong,” but others were rated “Satisfactory,” indicating some areas that need further development. **With feedback, the proposers could improve the project plan.**

___ Do not fund this proposal in its current form: The proposal does not align with the assessment grant program’s goals, or several of the elements above were rated as “Developing.” With feedback, the proposers could revise their project plan for consideration in future grant cycles.

Feedback to proposers:
